## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 712 LI 002 572

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Lane, David O. |
| TITLE | Study of the Decision-Making Procedures for the Acquisition of Science Library Materials and the Relation of These Procedures to the Requirements of College and University Library Patrons. |
| INSTITUTION | American Library Association, Chicago, Ill. |
| PUB DATE | 67 |
| NOTE | 123p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Biology, Chemistry, College Libraries, *Decision Making, *Library Acquisition, *Library Material Selection, Physics, *Science Materials, Study, University Libraries |

ABSTRACT

The idea that there was a need for formal study of the methods by which titles are selected for addition to the collections of academic science libraries resulted in this investigation of the selection processes of these libraries. Specifically, the study concentrates on the selection procedures in three sciences: biology, chemistry, and physics. Twenty institutions which are highly representative of the academic community in the United States were included in the study. This study has two major objectives: (1) to describe the selection processes as they actually exist and (2) to present practical guides designed to assist in the process of selection. Five levels of decision-making were identified as ultimately determining what materials are selected: (1) the library appropriation decision--the total amount of money received annually; (2) the acquisition budget decision--total amount of money designated for the purchase of materials; (3) the allotment decision--the ways in which the acquisition budget is distributed; (4) the collection decisions--the desired overall makeup of the collection and (5) the selection decisions--actual purchase of a specific title or item. The decision-makers and guides used in the decision-making process are identified. Each specific decision-making process--its efficiency, strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement are given. (NH)

ED047712

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# STUDY OF THE DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES FOR THE ACQUISITION OF SCIENCE LIBRARY MATERIALS AND THE RELATION OF THESE PROCEDURES TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARY PATRONS

by

David O. Lane

American Library Association
Chicago, Illinois

1967

LI 002572

## PREFACE

By 1965, the concern and interest felt by various individuals involved with academic science libraries (librarians, government officials, ALA staff members, etc.) resulted in the realization that there was a need for formal study of the methods by which titles are selected for addition to the collections of these libraries. During the ensuing months, as the idea was discussed, dissected and refined, it solidified into the concept of having an intensive investigation made of the selection (as opposed to acquisition) processes in these libraries.

Studies have been made and books written on the techniques of acquisition methods and procedures, but the subject of selection--who decides to add which items to a library's collections & WHY--has tended to remain shrouded in the twin veils of mystique and art. There have been papers written on this subject, of course, and some small factual studies undertaken, but nothing comprehensive has been attempted in the area.

As the ideas for the study were formulated it was decided to narrow the investigation down to an intensive look at selection procedures in three sciences--specifically, biology, chemistry, and physics. Ultimately, a research proposal along these lines was prepared by the American Library Association, submitted to the National Science Foundation, and a grant for the investigation was awarded.

It was decided that ALA would administer the study through its Office for Research and Development (ORD). ORD, in turn, would work through a subcontractor who would be selected on the basis of competitive bids, and who would be responsible for formulating the details of the data-gathering phase of the study and the actual collection of the data.

It was felt that non-librarians skilled in interviewing techniques, experienced in data collection, and expert in the organization of a study of this kind, working under the direction, and with the advice of, librarians, would probably carry out the study in a more objective fashion than would be possible if all the details of the study were attempted by members of the library profession.

A request for proposals was submitted to eight research organizations, ranging from library schools, library school associated research institutes, to large commercial research and development firms. In the meantime, the Advisory Committee to ALA's ORD had appointed a special committee of distinguished librarians to advise the ORD headquarters staff on all aspects of the study. It was this committee, working with the headquarters staff, that evaluated the research proposals which were submitted, and finally selected the firm to which the subcontract was awarded--Human Sciences Research, Inc. (HSR), of McLean, Virginia.

After the awarding of the contract, the tempo of work on the study increased. HSR, again working with the ORD staff and the special advisory committee, refined its research proposal and methods. The technique agreed upon was to send professional interviewers to 20 selected colleges and universities across the country to intensively interview various people involved in the selection processes. The actual techniques are described in detail in the following pages. The 20 institutions had been selected by the special advisory committee. Those chosen were carefully selected from small, medium, and fairly large (6,000 students and up) institutions representing various types and stages of academic development and geographical areas. They included private and publicly supported schools; stable and rapidly developing schools; new and old; small, and as mentioned above, rather large; urban and rural; Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western. It can be said with some assurance, therefore, that even though only 20 institutions were included in the study, ~~that~~ these institutions are highly representative of the academic community in the United States.

It is gratifying to note that of the institutions originally selected by the committee, all 20 agreed to participate in the study, even though it was evident that demands on the time of the librarians and others was to be considerable.

Once the institutions had been selected, the interview guides and data collection forms and techniques were perfected. The final arrangements for the trips by the interviewers were made, and the author was selected as the ORD Project Director for the study.

The interviewing and data collection, which was begun in the spring of 1967, was completed by June, and in December, 1967, Human Sciences Research, Inc., as the subcontractor, submitted its report to ALA. This volume is based upon the data contained in that report.

# PREFACE

This study has two major objectives. First, to describe the selection processes as they actually exist in academic libraries around the country, particularly those relating to the selection of materials in the sciences, and second, to present practical guides designed to assist in the process of selection in the sciences.

The basic research plan was straightforward. The required information was specified, information gathering forms and procedures were constructed, interviews were held, and the data was assembled. The results were then analyzed, and the report and guides based upon these results were drawn up.

The primary object of the study was the processes involved in the selection of science materials for college and university libraries. These processes were examined within the framework of the entire institution, and also in that of the library within the institution. Therefore, the institution, the library, and the selection processes were all objects of study.

No single technique or method of data collection is without bias or sources of error. The study attempted to minimize that bias and error by using a variety of techniques which did not share the same weaknesses to examine similar areas in the various schools. The main techniques used were questionnaires and interviews. Both of these techniques were applied to a number of sources of information at each of the 20 institutions visited.

An "Advanced Data Collection" questionnaire was sent to the head librarian prior to the visit by the interviewer. The purpose of this questionnaire was to obtain general statistical background data on the institution and its libraries.

The interview, however, was the major technique utilized in the study. Each institution was visited for five days. This time was devoted to interviews with the library staff, the administration, and the faculty.

The interviews resulted in over 7,000 responses, a "response" meaning a reply from one person to one question. In addition, there was a great mass of detail gathered through the use of the "Advanced Data Collection" questionnaires.

The greatest amount of data collected concerns the decision-making processes involved in selection. Five levels of decision-making were identified as ultimately determining what materials are selected for addition to a library's collections:

1. The library appropriation decision. The "library appropriation" is the total amount of money received annually by the library for all its operations.

2. The acquisition budget decision. The "acquisition budget" is the total amount of money designated for the purchase of library materials. Presumably this amount if a part of the "library appropriation" identified above. Included are funds for both monographs and serials.

3. The allotment decision. The "allotment of funds" refers to the ways in which the acquisition budget is distributed to, or earmarked for, the various departments for subject areas.

4. The collection decisions. These are the decisions that define the desired overall makeup of the library collections. The end product of these decisions might sometimes take the form of a written statement, indicating in what areas the library should be strong.

5. The selection decisions. These are the decisions to purchase a specific title or item.

For each of the above, questioning and analysis focused on three major areas: (1) the identification of those people who are in fact the decision-makers; (2) the identification of the information or guides used in the decision-making process; and (3) an evaluation of each specific decision-making process in terms of its efficiency, strengths, weaknesses, and suggested recommendations for improvement.

It must be made clear that many questions yielded more than one response from each respondent, and the number of these varied from person to person. For example, one faculty member might indicate six sources of information about new books, while another might indicate one. Or one librarian might offer five different suggestions for the improvement of present selection methods, while another might offer only one or two. In such cases the replies are usually presented in terms of the number of times the various comments or suggestions were made in the collective replies of all respondents.

The results presented in this study are, we ~~hope~~ believe, an accurate representation of what was found at the 20 institutions studied. By paying close attention to the data collection methods employed and by using experienced senior interviewers, we believe that errors resulting from imperfect comprehension or faulty interpretation have been held to a minimum.

While one may therefore have a high degree of confidence that the study has accurately described the selection processes at the 20 institutions visited, there is still the question of what the results mean in respect to the other 2,000 or so institutions of higher education in the country. As was pointed out earlier, the study was confined to 20 deliberately chosen institutions, and did not attempt to produce statistical estimates of the selection processes at all colleges and universities throughout the country. Nor did it employ the possible alternative method of randomly selecting the 20 institutions. A random selection might have permitted certain statistical tests of significance to be applied, but the small sample so selected would have minimized the chances of reporting statistically significant differences. The non-random selection finally chosen permitted certain infrequent variations to be observed which probably would not have been included in a randomly selected sample. The reader will recognize that there are some dangers inherent in generalizing from this limited sample to the larger academic population. Therefore, such generalizations must be his own responsibility. However, the institutions were selected on the basis that they represented, as nearly as possible, as large a cross section of the total academic community as was possible with the time and money available for the study.

As mentioned earlier, the institutions were located in urban, suburban and rural areas throughout the country. In terms of growth rate, four institutions were considered to be still developing at a fairly rapid rate, while sixteen had reached a state of relative stability. Nine were rather large (over 6,000 students) and eleven relatively small (under 4,000). In terms of ownership nine institutions were private, eleven were state supported.

One indication of the range of variations within the sample is revealed by the following statistics: student enrollment ranged from 900 to 23,500 (mean: 6,909); there were 54,000 to 750,000 volumes in the libraries (mean: 358,700); there were 6 to 151 library staff members, professional and non-professional (mean: 55.5); and 17 to 812 faculty members in the combined chemistry, physics, and biology departments, including teaching and research assistants (mean: 167). Their library budgets for 1965-66 ranged from $68,600 to $1,500,000, with a mean of $625,300.

As might have been expected, no new or radically different selection techniques were discovered in the course of the study, nor was any sudden insight gained into what has been described as the "mystique" of book selection. Rather, the investigation has provided a statistical basis for a discussion of the many factors involved in the complex field of collection development.

David O. Lane
Project Director
Chicago, Illinois
June 7, 1968

## Chapter I. Basic Budgetary Factors Influencing Academic Libraries

It is obvious that one of the basic factors influencing the acquisition performance of any library is the amount of funds available for this purpose. This is, of course, as true in the sciences as in any other subject area. In those relatively few academic libraries where the funds available are sufficient, or almost sufficient, to purchase most of the items considered important by both the faculty and the library staff, selection decisions are seldom a problem; everyone can be satisfied.

Unfortunately, this state of affairs seldom occurs. An important factor in the selection activities of any library, therefore, is the question of the adequacy of the library's total budget and, more directly, the sufficiency of funds available for the acquisition of library materials.

We may assume that in most academic libraries the preponderant proportion of the total library budget is in the form of an allocation from the parent institution--the academic administration, or sometimes the Board of Trustees or the State Legislature. Thus the question of those basic institutional decisions relating to the library's budget, in other words, who decides how much money will be available to the library, and how and why, is also of considerable importance to the problem of the acquisition of library materials.

An important part of the present study of science library material acquisitions was the attempt to discover answers to these questions in the twenty institutions which were included in the study. Some of the relevant information gathered follows.

First, how does the head librarian provide information on the library's financial needs to those administrators who make decisions regarding the total funds available to the library? In most cases, the initial step is a draft budget submitted to the administration. In 18 of the 20 institutions studied, the libraries were responsible for generating this initial budget. In the remaining two cases, the library either made no draft budget, or provided only general information to a non-library group responsible for preparing such a budget.

What is the librarian's estimate of needed funds based on? The 18 librarians who did prepare a budget were asked what factors entered into the library's estimate of funds required. In their replies to this question, the following factors were cited most often: consideration of the various general budget categories, i.e., book funds, salaries, supplies, etc. (cited 10 times); the rising cost of library materials and services (13 times); the number and type of incoming students (11 times); additions to the faculty (14 times); and curriculum requirements (14 times). It can be seen that, among these factors, the curriculum requirements and the nature of the user population were cited most frequently. A wide range of other factors were also cited: comparisons with other libraries (3 times); requirements of accreditation associations (6 times); the current state of the collection as determined by assessments and inventories (5 times); and relevant future plans of the institution (3 times). Factors cited only once or twice included: new areas of research; new library services; needs introduced by automation; number of grants and contracts received by the institution; present uncataloged backlog of books; expansion limitations imposed by present staffing and space; extent of inter-library loan operations; and user demands.

"Are there unusual budgeting problems associated with library materials for the sciences?" Of the 20 head librarians asked this question, the majority of the respondents (16) indicated that unusual problems did exist, while the remaining four felt that they did not. The types of unusual problems cited were as follows: science materials are more expensive (cited 7 times); the increasing number and cost of science journals (5 times); science departments exerting more pressure for departmental or branch libraries (twice); science departments having a more rapid growth rate (once); the present needs of sciences for special services (once).

The 20 head librarians were also asked: "Who is the final decision-maker as to the total amount of library funds?" Among the answers to this question the identity of the decision-maker was indicated as (several respondents mentioned more than one officer): president, chancellor, vice president, or vice chancellor (mentioned 17 times); treasurer, bursar, or business manager (7 times); academic dean or dean of faculty (5 times); Board of Directors, trustees, or regents (3 times); and the head librarian himself (once).

Sixteen of the 20 head librarians indicated that the information they provided to the decision-maker was influential in his final budget decision. The four remaining head librarians felt that their information was not influential. When asked what factors aside from the information provided by the library they felt the decision-maker relied upon arriving at a final total for the library budget, the 20 librarians mentioned the following: total funds available to the institution (mentioned 7 times); information regarding the library from the faculty (7 times); current mood of the state legislature (3 times); library budgets of past years (3 times); comparisons with other libraries (3 times); information from deans and other administrative personnel (twice); whether or not it was the "library's year" (twice). In regard to the money finally received by the library, the librarians were asked if the amount typically represented some fixed portion of the institution's total budget. Three of the librarians indicated that it did, while 17 replied that it did not.

Additional evidence on what factors influence the final decision-maker comes from the responses provided by the institutions' administrators. Seventeen of these administrators were interviewed about their sources of information concerning the needs and adequacy of the library and its collections. This data can be summarized as follows:

| Information Source of Institution Administrators (n = 17) | Number of Responses On Collection Adequacy | On Collection Needs |
|---|---|---|
| **Faculty** | 13 | 10 |
| **Deans**, Department/Division **Heads** | 6 | 7 |
| **Faculty/Library Committee** | 3 | 8 |
| **Head Librarian** | 3 | 8 |
| **Comparative Statistics and Standards** | 6 | 5 |
| **Special Studies** | 4 | 2 |
| **Other Library Personnel** | 0 | 3 |
| **New or Potential Faculty Members** | 3 | 1 |
| **Students** | 1 | 1 |
| **External Users** | 0 | 1 |

The above data appears to indicate that the administrators as a group relied most heavily on academic personnel for determining the adequacy of the library, but relied less heavily on these sources for assessing its needs. They appear to more often rely on the head librarian and his staff for information about the latter.

Ten of the 20 head librarians interviewed believed that the budget decision-maker could reach a "better" decision if he were provided with additional or different information. When asked what this information might be, four of these head librarians mentioned the need to direct more information towards the state legislature; two mentioned the need for more information regarding the needs of the academic departments; two mentioned more statistics concerning the book collections themselves; and two, more information which would keep the decision-maker "library minded."

During the interviews, 12 of the 20 head librarians said that they were satisfied with the present way of deciding what the library's appropriation should be; eight said they were not satisfied.

The 20 head librarians were also asked what the strong features of the present budgeting procedures were. One said that their method had no strong features. The remaining 19 identified a variety of features they considered to be favorable aspects of their present budgeting systems. The features mentioned were: the independence given the librarian to assess and reflect overall library needs (8 times); the close cooperation existing between the library and the decision-makers in the administration (8 times)· the flexibility of the procedure, it being neither too rigid nor too tied to an allocation formula (4 times); the informal give-and-take atmosphere, and the opportunity to obtain feedback and to defend one's position (4 times); the recommendations made by the faculty regarding departmental needs (4 times); the support provided by the faculty (twice); the presence of an automated bookkeeping system (once); the availability of additional funds when needed (twice); and the stability provided by the use of an allocation formula (once).

The weaknesses in the present system mentioned by the head librarians were as follows: (11 of the 20 felt that their present total budgeting system had no major weaknesses): not enough freedom given to truly reflect the needs of the institution (mentioned 3 times); the system is too subjective, too informal, and not based on objective data (3 times); the allocation formula used is too inflexible (twice); the major decision is made by people too remote from the library (once); there is inability to appeal the budget decision (once); not enough record keeping is done in order to do advance planning (once); and the bookkeeping system is not in accord with the purchasing needs of the library (once).

When asked what suggestions they had for improving the method of determining the library's total budget, 8 of the 20 head librarians made no suggestions. In the responses of the remainder, the following suggestions were included: increase the flexibility of the budgeting procedures in order to allow for contingencies (suggested 4 times); base the final decision on additional or different information (4 times); change the budget categories (3 times); provide for more involvement of both the faculty and the library staff (twice); provide a stronger role for the librarian in the budgeting decision (twice); shorten the time period over which the budget is projected (3 times); increase the time period for which the budget is projected (once);

provide a longer lead time for budget planning (one); and on occasion use a management consultant to aid in budget development (once).

A primary component of interest to this study is the portion of the total library budget devoted to the acquisition of books and periodicals. In terms of dollar amounts the following ranges existed among the 20 institutions studied for the fiscal year 1965-66: books - a low of $10,500 to a high of $434,636 (the mean was $175,000); periodicals - a low of $3,500 to a high of $345,065 (the mean was $80,000).

The 20 head librarians intereviewed were asked to discuss who contributed to the decision as to what part of the total library budget would become the acquisitions budget. The following persons were named in their replies: the faculty (9 times); the head librarian in consultation with the library staff (8 times); the head librarian or his designee, alone (7 times); the president or other administrative members (twice); and the state legislature is involved in this decision (once). In two replies it was stated that the portion of the total budget devoted to acquisitions was determined by a fixed appropriation formula. It should be noted that no head librarian mentioned the library committee as a contributor toward this budget question.

As to what factors enter into the making of this decision, the head librarians mentioned the following: the needs and uses of the various departments in previous years (mentioned 9 times); the rising costs of library materials (8 times); the influences of the future growth and institutional changes on the departmental and institutional balance (6 times); the possibility of receiving additional external funds (4 times); standing order commitments (twice); periodical subscriptions commitments (once); and weak areas in the collections (once). Six of the 20 institutions reported that the sum allocated for books and periodical acquisitions represented a definite portion of the total library budget. However, three of these six viewed this as an unintentional happenstance, that is, that it just happened to occur that way over the last few years.

The question of external grants or federal funds for library materials was relevant to this discussion. Sixteen of the 20 libraries had received one or more of these types of outside assistance. Three had not, and one institution was ineligible for federal funds of these kinds. The 16 recipient libraries all had received funds under Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Six had received National Science Foundation grants. Two had obtained funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Two had received funds under Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and two had received grants of unspecified natures.

In regard to the degree of their satisfaction with the present methods of determining their acquisition budgets, 11 of the 20 head librarians said they were well satisfied, five said they were satisfied on some aspects, but not on others, and four reported that they were largely dissatisfied with their present methods.

The features of the present method which the head librarians felt were its strong points were enumerated as follows: the method is flexible and is not tied to a rigid allocation formula (mentioned 5 times); the ultimate decision is based on a variety of factors (5 times); the library has budgetary control of (3 times); there is freedom on the part of the library to seek outside supplemental funds, grants, etc. (twice); the method provides for the satisfaction of actual needs (once); since a fixed allocation formula is used, the budget is easy to make out (once); having an allocation formula is useful to the majority of libraries in this system (once); having the departments estimate their book needs fosters their involvement in cooperation with the library (once). Only one of the librarians felt that the present system had no strong points.

Some of the weaknesses of the present method were mentioned the following numbers of times: the present method is too inflexible (6 times); it is based upon inadequate information pertaining to new academic programs (4 times); it compels the library to act as an accountant for the various departments (once); it requires the commitment of the total staff to adhere to rigid advance estimates (once); and the inability to plan ahead affects hiring efficiency (once).

The following suggestions for improving their present budgeting methods were made by the head librarians: greater attention to our particular library's needs as opposed to other libraries within our state system (4 times); an increase in the number of decision-makers involved (3 times); greater coordination among the present decision-makers (3 times); a better allocation formula (twice); more consideration of the library's users outside the parent institution's primary community (once); the creation of separate budget line items for each departmental allocation to increase faculty involvement (once); the ability to defer a portion of the book funds when outside money becomes available and must be spent quickly (once); a closer watch over such important shifting factors as total output of new titles, new media, etc. (once); and a more frequent assessment of the collections (once). Seven of the head librarians felt that their system had no major weaknesses.

After the decision has been made as to what portion of the total library budget should be used for acquisitions, it is necessary to decide how much, if any, of this acquisitions fund should be sub-allocated to the various departments or schools within the academic institution. Once this is done, there is still the question of how much of the funds will be for faculty selection, how much for library staff selection, and whether or not a totally separate book budget will be set up for each department.

Thirteen of the 20 libraries were able to provide financial data on the acquisition funds specifically allocated for the sciences under discussion ( biology, chemistry, and physics) for the fiscal year 1965-66 (books and periodicals only, binding funds excluded): funds allocated for physics range from a low of $440 to a high of $15,800, with an average of $5,160. Funds for chemistry range from a low of $440 to a high of $23,300, with an average of $7,270. In the field of biology, the low was $660, and the high $33,825, with an average of $7,234.

In four of the 20 libraries studied, no division of the general acquisition funds occurs and a first come-first served strategy prevails. In their responses to questioning, the following methods of distribution indicating the relative participation of various members of the academic community and the departmental allocation decision were mentioned: the librarian decides with library staff assistance (11 times); a fixed formula or proportion serves as a guide (5 times); the faculty is influential (4 times); the faculty library committee is influential (3 times); and the decision is made by a committee composed of library faculty and administrative personnel (once).

Of the 17 faculty library committee chairmen interviewed, ten indicated that their committees are involved in some aspects of the library budget allocation procedures. The following descriptions of the committees' participation in activities relating to the distribution of the acquisitions portion of the total library budget at the departmental allotment level were obtained: we review the history and plans of the departments to determine satisfactory book funding (3 committees); we review the departmental requests for book funds (2 committees); we use a formal instrument such as a questionnaire, survey, or formula to determine departmental allocation (2 committees); our committee in effect serves as a rubber stamp for predetermined departmental allocations (1 committee); we review and modify as necessary, predetermined departmental allocations (1 committee); we are the sole determiner of departmental book funds (1 committee).

In those 16 of the 20 libraries studied in which the acquisitions funds were allocated among the departments or schools, it was found that in 13 of them separate budgets for the various departments do exist. In 11 of these 13 libraries the departments are informed of the specific amount of their book fund allotment, while surprisingly enough, at the remaining two libraries, the departments do not know the exact amount of their book fund allotments.

The answers to a question directed to what influences the determination of the book budgets specifically allocated to Science Departments in those 13 institutions where such budgets exist, included the following factors: the size of the department, the number and level of courses taught, and past book selection performance (mentioned 9 times); knowledge of the future plans of the given department (5 times); faculty-library negotiations (3 times); a fixed formula is used (3 times); negotiations within the faculty library committee (twice); the comprehensiveness of the collections (once); the direct influence of the academic administration (once); and a computation of the yearly published output in the specific science field times the average book cost in that field yields a relative distribution pattern among the various departments (once).

Chapter II. Acquisition Policies and Goals.

Guide I

IDENTIFY AND STATE IN WRITING THOSE POLICIES, OBJECTIVES, GOALS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS WHICH DETERMINE THE DIRECTION AND SCOPE IN WHICH THE LIBRARY COLLECTION SHOULD DEVELOP.

*From a knowledge ~~the statements~~ of the policies, objectives, etc., of the library and its parent institution, a statement of the nature of the collection and the current selection objectives must be written to include:*

a. *__Service policy__. The nature of the user groups served by the library and its parent academic institution; the nature of the service rendered to them; and the relative priorities of the various library services offered to these users.*

b. *__Environmental characteristics__. Any relevant aspects of the user groups, the library or its parent academic institution, or the environment external to these (e.g., study habits of the users; location of the library relative to the parent institution; accessibility of other library resources in the area).*

c. *__Collection Specifications__. Those subject areas which are of interest to a given library, then within each subject area, the nature of the materials, as well as the depth and breadth of the collecti~~ng~~on desired.*

*d.* *Current Collection Needs.* *This is simply the difference between the collection specifications as developed above and the library's collections as they exist at present.*

One of the major duties of ~~a~~ any librarian should be to identify and articulate those policies, objectives, goals, and environmental conditions which determine the shape and direction, of a library's collection development. ~~and scope in which the collections of a given academic library should be developing~~.

These policies and goals are, at least in part, determined by the educational and research objectives of the particular institution, its unique environmental factors, and the nature of its existing collections.

Additionally, the librarian must actively seek out any and all information on future plans of the institution which might have implications for the objectives of the library and the demands which may be placed upon it.

Though perhaps obvious, it is fundamental to our purposes, and therefore must be stated, that the head librarian must determine (at some institutions a more apt word might be "unearth") those relevant selection policies and objectives which must exist, even if they have not been formulated. These policies and objectives may then be used to make a meaningful statement on the desired nature of the library's collections and its current selection objectives. The basic components of such a statement might include the following factors: service policy, environmental characteristics, collection specifications and current collection needs.

## ~~Chapter II.~~ - Acquisition Policies and Goals.

[illegible] a [illegible]

The nature of the user groups served by the library and its parent academic institution; the nature of the service rendered to them; and the relative priorities of the various library services offered to these users.

Chapter ~~II. Acquisition~~ Policies and Goals. —2

b. Environmental characteristics.

Any relevant aspect of the user groups, the library or its parent academic institution, or the environment external to these (e.g., study habits of the users; location of the library relative to the parent institution; accessibility of other library resources in the area).

c. Collection specifications.

Those subject areas which are of interest to a given library, then within each subject area, the nature of the materials, as well as the depth and breadth of collecting desired.

d. Current collection needs.

This is simply the difference between the collection specification as developed above and the library's collections as they exist at present.

Of the 20 libraries studied in the preparation of this report, 17 did not have a written selection or collection development policy. Of the three that had such a document, one reported that it was of little practical use. A complicating factor here is the ambiguity associated with the term "policy". To some, a "policy" is a lofty statement of noble goals; to others, a written statement of detailed ordering procedures; to most, it seems to be a document of little practical use in the day-to-day activities of libraries.

Such ambiguities do not lessen the overwhelming need for such a document to serve as a firm foundation on which to build the library collections needed for a particular and unique academic institution.

## Chapter 2. Acquisition Policies and Goals.

Hand in hand with the need for the librarian to be aware of the overall policies and objectives of his institution, is the more specific requirement that the librarian be kept abreast of, and participate in, discussions that might lead to a new department, school, college, or degree program in the present institution. The librarian should never first hear of such a program by reading about it in the college newspaper (something that has happened all too often in the past). Rather obviously this requirement places a burden on librarians to educate the administrators at his institution of the vital part the library can and must play in all educational aspects of the institution. This is not a battle that will be won overnight. It will require continuing effort on the librarian's part to "train" his peers in the faculty and the administration of the school to remember the library implications of major shifts or changes in its academic programs.

Among areas that the library must be informed of are:

- New course offerings
- New degree programs
- New schools, departments and colleges
- New faculty members
- Changes in areas of internal emphasis
- Major increases in enrollment
- Departmental efforts to obtain outside funds

Only by constantly keeping abreast of and, hopefully, participating in discussions leading to the kinds of activities discussed above will a librarian be able to see to it that a collection development policy or guide is kept up to date and meaningful.

The 20 institutions studied in the compilation of data and opinions that constituted the first stage of this project produced a number of items of information, both factual and subjective, pertinent to the problems of selection policies in collection development. As stated above, three of the 20 institutions visited had existing collection development or selection policy statements. The head librarians at these three institutions were asked: "What circumstances lead to policy revision?" In their responses these head librarians cited various factors which would lead to policy revision, including the following: a change in the goals of the institution; a change in the administration; dissatisfaction with the policy among either the faculty or the administration; possible revision due to sheer passage of time; a change in the funding situation; and technological changes.

Bringing the matter close to the primary subject of this investigation - selection procedures in the sciences - another question asked of the head librarians at all 20 institutions was: "Are there collection policies specific to the sciences?" Eleven of the 20 (surprisingly enough not including the three which had written policy statements), said that there were selection policies which were specific to the sciences. In other words, the sciences appeared to most of these librarians to have certain unique problems when it comes to selecting material for them.

The 17 libraries which did not have a written policy or collection development statement were asked why they did not have one. Among the most frequently cited reasons were these: no need felt for a formal statement; would be too inflexible - library must do the best it can as needs and resources change; close cooperation between faculty and library precludes the need for a written policy statement; comprehensive automatic ordering procedures preclude the need for a written policy statement. Less frequent comments included the following: the inability to develop and agree on a good one; we should write one but haven't had the time; the lack of a faculty library committee prevents the important faculty participation which is needed for policy development; with our pressing needs the faculty would have been impatient with such a statement; we would need specific information from the administration and it has not provided it; people dislike rules, preferring freedom to operate as they see fit.

It is interesting to note that 12 of the 17 head librarians interviewed at institutions which had no written selection or collection policy statement felt that they could still control the type of collection being developed at their institution.

Another question asked, this time of both head librarians and those members of their staffs involved in the selection of science materials, pertinent to selection policies was the following: "Are there any selection principles indicative of the nature of the desired collection?" In the replies of the 63 librarians who answered this question, the following statements were made, which gives some indication of the kind of collection they were trying to achieve, and the collection policies they were trying to establish: we acquire those works directly supportive of institutional goals (made 17 times); selections are made primarily in support of the curriculum (16 times); we emphasize comprehensiveness, i.e., attempt to fill in gaps in the collections (13 times); we avoid purchasing textbooks (13 times); we acquire textbooks of key authors only (2 times); we acquire whatever is requested (9 times); we attempt to anticipate users' needs (2 times); we emphasize quality, i.e., scholarly works (11 times); we avoid duplication (8 times); we duplicate only insofar as necessary to meet departmental needs (2 times); we place emphasis upon current materials (4 times); we buy foreign language materials only at the research level (3 times); the library selects the undergraduate and inter-disciplinary materials (1 times); and we check other area libraries before buying expensive reference materials (1 time).

Again relating to the question of selection in the sciences, the following question was asked: "Do specific selection practices indicate that the nature of the science collection is viewed differently from the rest of the collection?" The replies were: journals are more important to the sciences than to other fields - 4 libraries; science materials become obsolete more rapidly - 3 libraries; the volume of science materials is greater - 3 libraries; more funds are available to purchase science materials - 2 libraries; costs are higher in this field - 1 library; more need for standing orders in the sciences - 1 library; more consideration is given to the individual scientist's research needs - 1 library. Additional reasons were given for specific science selection practices that had more to do with operational problems than with the nature of the collection itself: less retrospective purchasing occurs in the sciences - 2 libraries; it is harder for librarians to do the selecting in these special areas - 1 library; the presence of departmental science libraries creates duplication problems - 1 library; the presence of departmental science libraries creates duplication problems - 1 library; broad coverage is not obtained by science faculty selectors - they have very narrow specialities - 1 library.

Fundamental to the question of what the goal of a specific academic library should be, is the broader problem of how the parent institution views itself and what it feels its goals to be. A group of questions attempting to investigate this problem were asked of various administrators at the 20 institutions studied. Among the pertinent questions was: "What are the functions of this institution?" Twelve administrators replied that the principal function was to provide a broad basic education in the liberal arts tradition. A second major function was seen by six administrators as being the conduct of research and the preparation of students for research careers. Five replied, "Graduate level education," and two replied, "Preparing people for the professions." Two of the

17 administrators stated that the institution's primary function lay in providing basic education in engineering and the sciences. Providing quality teaching was mentioned by four administrators, and preparing people for teaching careers was mentioned by three. Four other administrators responded that their institutions' special function was to be responsive to the needs of the state, i.e., to fulfill a public service function, while one cited the need to serve the broader professional and scientific community. Less frequently cited functions included: educating deprived minority groups; aiding community colleges in the state; and providing free professional training.

A question asked of 20 head librarians, 175 faculty members, 16 faculty library committee chairmen, and 17 administrators interviewed in the course of this study was, "what are the functions of the library?" Their responses and the number of times the various functions were mentioned in the replies are shown in the table following:

| RESPONSES | H. L. (n = 20) | FAC. (n = 175) | F/L (n = 16) | ADMIN. (n = 17) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Provide and store information for: | | | | |
| Research, by faculty and/or students | 5 | 33 | 8 | 9 |
| Teaching, education, orientation, "broadening," etc. | 4 | 30 | 4 | 4 |
| Serve as a major educational resource, e.g., "heart of the university" | 5 | 14 | 9 | 4 |
| Serve as an ancillary educational resource to established curriculum | 5 | 19 | 3 | 3 |
| Provide access to store of information | 5 | — | 4 | 1 |
| Provide adequate circulation procedure | — | 14 | — | - |
| Provide reproduction and interlibrary loan service | — | 31 | — | - |
| Provide active support of faculty/student goals | 5 | — | 3 | 2 |
| Provide bibliographic and reference services | 1 | 12 | — | - |
| Provide course-specific or research project-specific material (implies above and beyond routine provision of store of information; implies purposeful faculty/library interaction | 2 | 23 | 1 | — |
| Serve as a study facility for students | 4 | 11 | 2 | — |
| Serve as a cultural (e.g., museum, "shrine of human knowledge") source | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Make information available to serve and support all citizens of the state and/or general community | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Serve as a source for non-academic (recreational) information (popular books, magazines) | 4 | 4 | — | — |
| Instruct or orient students in uses of library | 3 | 4 | 1 | — |
| Act primarily as a service organization | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 |

It is apparent from the foregoing, that in spite of the fact that a wide variety of responses were given, the responses of all groups tend to cluster around the provision of information in support of research and the curriculum.

Another group of questions was asked of these same people, centering around the question of whether the library actually fulfills its functions on the campus. There was widespread agreement (in the range of 75-85%) by most of the three groups that their own libraries were fulfilling the functions expected of them. The complaints voiced rest mainly with the collection of books itself and the degree of access to it.

Of the 20 head librarians interviewed, eight stated that their library was fulfilling its function quite well. Nine said fairly well.

Three replied not well at all.

Of the 175 faculty members interviewed, 79 replied that the library was fulfilling its functions quite well; 58 said fairly well; 19 said not well. Most of these 19 mentioned accessibility of the collections as a major problem.

Among the faculty library committee chairman (14 of whom were asked this question), 5 replied that their library fulfilled its functions quite well; 6 said fairly well; 3 said not well at all. Two of these three complaints were specifically directed toward the lack of accessibility of the book collections.

Following up this question, administrators and the faculty library chairman were asked what the parent institution should do to ensure that the library be able to meet the demands placed upon it. Their replies are shown below:

|  | F/L (n = 16) | ADMIN. (n = 17) |
|---|---|---|
| Provide money -- funds for expanding budget costs, etc. | 11 | 11 |
| Support and aid faculty to know and make known their views on library needs | 7 | 9 |
| Support library staff: | 4 | 6 |
| Acquire sufficient staff |  |  |
| Acquire types needed for selection and collection development |  |  |
| Help staff acquire needed materials |  |  |
| Help staff help faculty choose materials |  |  |
| Help staff make materials accessible |  | 2 |
| Facilitate communication of needs to administration from faculty to library | 2 | 2 |
| Obtain objective data (for assessment, obtaining support, "selling" others on needs, etc.) | 1 | 3 |

It can be seen that there was very little disagreement between these two groups as to the steps that should be taken by the institution in ensuring the adequacy of the library's collections. Money is seen as a primary ingredient, followed closely by the necessity for increased support for the library staff ~~in~~ and increased cooperation between the library staff and the members of the faculty.

At another point in the interview, the same poeple were asked: "Is appropriate support and attention now being given to your library?" Of the 16 faculty library committee chairmen, six replied yes; four replied yes, but with some qualification; while six were quite dissatisfied. Among the major complaints, there were six mentions of a lack of funds; three mentions of a lack of sufficient space or facilities; four of inadequate staffing or salaries; and two of inadequate book collections.

Of the 17 administrators to whom this question was put, three said yes; eight replied with a qualified yes; and six said no. Among the major complaints there were seven mentions of a lack of funds; two of a shortage of space or facility; one of inadequate staffing or staff salaries; and three of the inadequacy of the collections themselves.

The final bit of data pertaining to this topic comes from the replies to the question asked of the head librarians: "What are the major selection-related problems facing you?" Four of the 20 head librarians stated that there were no current major problems in selection. Among the replies of the remaining 16 head librarians, a wide range of problems was cited. There were four mentions of funding problems in the budgetary situation; three of the problem of promoting faculty interest in the library and its selection procedures; two of the lack of a clear selection policy; and two of the lack of balance in the collections. In addition, the following problems were each mentioned once: the growth in the volume of materials available; pressure toward greater decentralization of book selection responsibility and for greater decentralization of the library's central collection; lack of communication between faculty and the library; the coverage of interdisciplinary areas not taking up all good material; faculty complaints that only material of secondary value is acquired; the lack of a formal check on whether the selection policy, if any, is being followed; new faculty who do not know what the selection policies are.

Chapter III. Roles and Responsibilities of Book Selectors.

GUIDE II

DETERMINE THE IDENTIFY OF THOSE PERSONS WHO DO THE INITIAL SELECTION FOR THE COLLECTION.

*Skills necessary for good selection:*

a. *An understanding of vocabulary and a conception of the subject area for which selection is being done.*

b. *A knowledge of research and study in the subject area and its relative importance in the parent institution.*

c. *A quantitative knowledge of the literature of the subject area.*

d. *An awareness of selection tools for the subject area (and access to them).*

e. *A knowledge of the relationship of continguous subject areas to the main area of selection.*

GUIDE III

ONE LIBRARY STAFF MEMBER MUST HAVE THE SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR GUIDING ALL ASPECTS OF COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT.

*Opportunity should be provided:*

a. *To perform a balanced selection to avoid undue concentration on current imprints.*

b. *For contact with the users of the material to determine adequacy and appropriateness of the selection.*

In any academic library it is possible to determine those persons within the institution who do the actual initial selection of additions to the library's collections. These primary selectors, whether they are library staff members, faculty members, or a combination of the two, must possess certain skills and must be presented with certain opportunities, among which are the following:

1. A working understanding of the basic vocabulary, concepts and methods of research within the field or areas of interest.
2. Knowledge of those areas of research and study which together comprise the specific science in question, and the relative importance of each area to the teaching and research activities of the institution.
3. Quantitative knowledge of the past and present dimensions of the literature in question.
4. Awareness of and access to an adequate cross-section of selection tools.
5. Knowledge of the relationship of a specific field to its contiguous fields within the broad framework of scientific endeavor.
6. Sufficient time in which to perform balanced selection activities so as to avoid undue concentration of efforts on current imprints.
7. Contact with the users of the material selected so that opinions may be obtained on the adequacy and appropriateness of the selections.

Additionally there should be one person on the staff of the library, the chief of acquisitions, the chief bibliographer, or perhaps the librarian himself, in smaller institutions, who has the specific responsibility for guiding all aspects of the collection development.

Judging from the information gathered in the preparation of this report at 20 academic institutions, and from the general tenor of the published literature, the actual title selection responsibility is normally divided among the faculty and the library staff. This makes it all the more important that there be one member of the library staff who has overall responsibility for the development of the library's collections. Usually this person would be the head librarian, the assistant librarian, or perhaps the chief of acquisitions. In practice, as the library system and staff grow, these administrators may have less and less time to devote to such development supervision. Thus there is a need for a librarian, whether his title be head librarian or chief bibliographer, who sees to it that the library's collections are developing in accordance with the collection development plans discussed in Chapter II. He is the one who must, on occasion, veto a selection request regardless of whether or not it originated with the library staff or the faculty. He is the one who will, from time to time, have to order books for the collection in areas being missed by the primary selectors. One of his prime responsibilities will be to see to it that the manner in which the available book funds are distributed over the various subject areas of interest to the library is equitable and that the funds are, in fact, being spent in such a way as to best develop the collection so as to meet the needs of the library and its parent institution and users.

On the more basic level of the individual primary selector, whether he is a faculty member or a librarian, the requirements outlined at the beginning of this chapter must be met; in order to meet these standards the following factors might be considered:

If a faculty member is designated as a departmental library representative, this position usually requires a considerable amount of time in order to properly fulfill the added duties associated with book selection. It would be very much to the benefit of the library and the institution if this library faculty representative were to have his other extra-curricular duties (i.e., committee memberships, etc.), and perhaps his teaching load as well, reduced in order that he have sufficient time to properly execute the demands of such a task. Obviously, the head librarian cannot tell a professor that now that he is working with the library he should drop all his faculty Senate duties or cut his teaching load. However, it is not impossible that over a period of time the head librarian could influence the policy of an academic institution to the extent that the importance of the faculty library representative to the institution would be recognized and the policy changes mentioned above would be initiated in order to ensure that this representative would have sufficient time to do the job properly. If the importance of this task is not recognized by his fellow faculty members or the administration (as is all too often the case), the result is usually that the representative will have insufficient time to do a good job, or that his other duties must be neglected, which may perhaps lead to a sense of resentment towards the library on his part for requiring so much of his time. Such conditions cannot, of course, lead to the proper execution of this important task.

If a member of the library staff is engaged in the substantial amount of selection in a particular subject area, it would be wise if he had a reasonable background in that field. If he lacks practical experience in the subject, or a formal educational background in it, it might often be wise to allow him to audit those courses within the field which would provide a basic working vocabulary and an introduction to the literature of the field.

Obviously a competent librarian could, in due time, pick up such knowledge "on the job". Librarians have been doing this for years. But it would seem much more efficient if this learning process could be speeded up and formalized by his enrollment in appropriate courses of study (either on a credit, or non-credit basis) - assuming that appropriate courses of instruction are available. The benefits to the library, both to its internal operation, to the quality of the resulting collection, and last, but by no means least, to its relationship with the teaching faculty, are obvious.

One or two suggestions in regard to procedural details might be made here as a result of observations made during the interviewing stage of the study. First, library administration should be sure that the selectors, especially if they are faculty members, are aware of the wide range of bibliographic tools and guides available for current selection. All too often those responsible for the growth of subject collections are totally unaware of any aids beyond the usual journal advertisements, reviews, and publishers' flyers. While these are necessary and worthwhile sources of bibliographic information, faculty selectors should be made aware of certain "library oriented" aids such as Publishers' Weekly, CHOICE, New Technical Books, etc. Again, based upon observations made during the interviewing for this project, many faculty members would be more than happy to utilize such tools if they were only aware of their existence. Second, mention might be made of the small service, one might almost say courtesy, that could do a great deal toward building goodwill and understanding between the library and its faculty selectors (staff selectors too, for that matter). This is for the library to institute some sort of a form notice to advise the selector of the action taken on his suggestion, such as: received, not ordered because out of print, already on order by the library, etc. This service might seem self-evident to many, but it is surprising the number of libraries that do not provide it.

Various questions were asked at the 20 institutions studied that have a bearing on the subject of the role of selectors and their responsibilities. These questions were asked of the head librarian, members of the library staff, faculty members, administrators, and, whenever possible, the chairmen of the faculty library committees on each of the campuses visited. Among the specific questions asked were the following: "Who initiates and vetoes or approves requests for the purchase of science library materials?" The responses of the 20 head librarians to this question can be summarized as follows:

[INSERT CHART ON PAGE ~~6[illegible]~~ 48]

Chapter III. Roles and Responsibilities of Book Selectors. 6A

| Persons Cited by Head Librarians | Number of Responses<br>Initiation | Approval/Veto |
|---|---|---|
| Individual faculty members | 19 | 0 |
| Department (faculty) representatives | 6 | 1 |
| A group decision by the faculty within a department | 0 | 3 |
| Department Chairmen | 0* | 3 |
| Head Librarian and/or assistant | 5 | 13 |
| Science-reference specialists | 2 | 3 |
| Order/acquisition librarian | 7 | 4 |
| General reference specialists | 3 | 4 |
| Serials librarian | 2 | 4 |
| Department or branch librarians | 2 | 0 |
| Library personnel (unspecified) | 5 | 0 |
| Students | 1 | 0 |

* Department Heads would also be considered as individual faculty members for initiation purposes.

"Who has the final approval on the library staff selection choices?" The 46 library staff members who were active in the selection of science materials were asked this question, and they responded as follows: myself (22 replies); the head librarian (8 replies); my superior on the library staff (8 replies); a member of the faculty (6 replies); and, myself, but only for books costing less than a certain monetary limit (2 replies).

"Do faculty and library staff consult each other on book selections?" Thirty-one of the 66 library staff members and head librarians who were asked if they sought the advice of faculty members indicated that the faculty were "frequently" consulted on selections made by the library staff. Other responses received were: "occasionally, when faculty expertise is needed, or the item is expensive"; and "no, very rarely." It is interesting, however, to note that 39 of the 66 librarians who answered this question stated that the faculty did not consult them when making selection decisions. Twenty-six replied that the faculty did consult them, but at least half of these said that it was to obtain budgetary or bibliographic information only.

"Are there differences in selection procedures among the science departments?" Head librarians were asked this question. Fifteen of the 20 reported that their science departments all used the same selection procedures, while five reported that there were differences among the various departments. Some of the latter added that they thought it was the department's prerogative to establish its own procedure.

Though the question of the internal allotment of book funds within a given department would, at first, seem to be merely another aspect of fund allocation, in reality, it becomes a factor in selection. If all selection for a given department is done by one man, obviously the criteria for adding volumes will be different from the situation in which ~~what~~ results when all members participate in such endeavor.

The head librarians, where it was applicable, were also asked if they knew how the funds allotted to the various academic departments were distributed within the department. Eleven head librarians responded, and among their responses were the following: (Note: several librarians responded in more than one fashion to this question): don't know (4); there are considerable variations among departments in this regard (5); individual allotments occur within the individual ~~same~~ department (3); everyone is equal, all order as they see fit (3); funds are kept in a departmental pool which the department chairman controls (2); ~~preference~~ allocation is tailored to the individual need, e.g., newcomers and active researchers may receive more (2). One library employed a unique system which made a direct allocation to each faculty member. This particular system has been in existence for a number of years and, according to reports, has been well received by both faculty and library.

Sixty-six science departments at 20 institutions were visited in the course of this study. These departments included the subject areas of physics, chemistry, and biology. Where biology did not exist as a separate entity, two more specific areas, usually zoology and botany, were substituted. Usually three members of a department were interviewed -

the departmental chairman, the library representative (if there was one), and one other member of the department. Where two subject areas, such as zoology and botany were involved, this number was limited to the department chairman and the library representative.

How do the science departments do their selecting? Two predominant types of procedures were in overwhelming evidence. In the first, all the faculty members of the department were free to select as they saw fit, and shared more or less equally in the selection, and no one member, it appeared, did more than half the department's total selection. The second predominant type was that in which more than half of the department's library selections were made by a single faculty member.

In one or two instances a third variant selection procedure was discovered. In this the departmental members met periodically and voted on selections nominated by all the members of the department over some given period of time.

How prevalent were these three types of selection procedures? An evaluation of the 66 departments visited indicated the following distribution: multiple selectors predominant (43); single selectors predominant (17); departmental vote procedure (3); unspecified (3). (The last category includes three departments which simply do not fit into the three other types. One such department had only two members and could not therefore be categorized adequately. Another used a strange mixture in which the members voted on some suggestions, and the remaining selection funds were left to individuals. In the third department it was impossible to determine whether the library committee or its chairman actually did the selection.)

Another interesting question asked of both library staff and faculty members was: For whose use are the library materials being selected? In the replies of the 43 library staff members asked this question, the following groups were mentioned: the students in general (35 times); the faculty (32 times); graduate students in particular (10 times); undergraduate students in particular (7 times); the library staff (5 times); ~~in~~ users external to the university or college (3 times). In the answers of the 175 faculty members queried, the following groups were mentioned: in general, the students (144 times); the faculty (84 times); graduate students in particular (82 times); undergraduate students in particular (56 times); faculty members other than the one doing the selecting (7 times).

A related question was: What purposes are served by the library materials selected by the faculty? One hundred seventy-five faculty members were ~~also~~ asked this question. The following purposes were mentioned in their answers: the material was selected for teaching and classroom use (44 times); the material was selected for research needs (63 times); general reference needs (18 times); to round out a collection (14 times); 19 other scattered replies were made.

One interesting question asked of 111 faculty members was: Does the language, e.g., foreign versus English, in the material influence the selection decision? Seventy-three replied that language was a definite factor and that few or no foreign language materials were ordered. Thirty-eight replied that language was not a restrictive factor and that foreign language material was freely ordered.

One hundred seventy-five faculty members were asked: What selection tools do you use in deciding on new additions for the library's collections? Most of the faculty ~~men~~ members mentioned more than one tool. Those mentioned were: publishers' flyers (134 times); publishers' catalogs (40 times); contact with publishers' representatives (18 times); book displays at professional conventions (18 times); reviews in journals (81 times); advertisements in journals (56 times); references in professional papers (12 times); recommended lists of books (39 times); contact with colleagues (26 times); professional conferences (12 times); professional library selection tools (5 times); the acquisition lists of other libraries (4 times). The same question was asked of 45 librarians. The selection tools mentioned in their replies were: professional library selection tools (32 times); publishers' flyers (18 times); publishers' catalogs (18 times); reviews in professional journals other than library journals (8 times); advertisements in that type of journal (5 times); recommended book list (twice); and the acquisition lists of other libraries (twice). The above replies indicate that the use of certain types of selection tools is common to both groups, i.e., publishers' flyers, publishers' catalogs, journal advertisements, and reviews in professional journals. However, the average faculty member probably does most of his selecting from these few sources, while the typical librarian is more likely to use the so-called professional library selection tools more heavily. A more specific look at the use of selection tools is presented in the lists in the Appendix to this report (see pages ). These lists include the specific titles of serials, monographs, and other tools used by both faculty and library staff members, along with an indication of the number of times each was cited.

The following question was asked of the 20 head librarians: For what reason might a request for a particular title be vetoed? Among the reasons cited were: budgetary reasons would be most likely, in other words, that the title was too expensive or that acquisition funds were exhausted (16 times); the lack of relevance of the item (7 times); conflicts with policy as regards to duplication of titles (4 times); the item was an unindexed periodical and its use was therefore limited (3 times); and that the item did not meet quality standards (once).

One hundred seventy-two faculty members were asked: How familiar are you with the library's holdings in your area of interest? Ninety-one replied that they were very familiar; 60 that they were fairly familiar; and surprisingly, 21 replied that they were not very familiar at all. In general, it could be said that the faculty members consider themselves knowledgeable about their own portions of the total library collections.

The same faculty members were asked how they acquired or maintained their familiarity with the book collections. Of the 121 who replied, 51 said that they had selected much of the holdings themselves; 46 said that they browse in the stacks; 19 said simply through normal usage; and 5 said through the use of periodic inventories of the stacks.

The question: How much time is spent on book selection decision-making in any given week? was asked of both 172 faculty members and 34 library staff members. The average time estimated was 1.2 hours per week for the faculty, and 4.2 hours per week for the library staff members. Though it might seem that all the members of a given department spending approximately an hour a week doing book selection could add up to quite a total, it must be remembered that most likely all are looking at the same publishers' flyers, catalogs, reading the same reviews, etc. The amount of duplicate work going on at this point could be considerable.

Three distinct groups - faculty, library staff, and head librarians - were asked the question: Are you satisfied with the present procedures for selecting science library materials? Of the 175 faculty members, 131 were quite satisfied, while 44 were dissatisfied. Of the 45 library staff members who were asked this question, 40 were quite satisfied while five were dissatisfied. Of the 19 head librarians, 15 were quite satisfied, four were dissatisfied. Obviously the majority of those concerned appear to be satisfied with their present procedures. However, one of the three interviewers observed that many of the faculty who said they were satisfied seemed to have said this simply because they were not aware there were other, or perhaps better ways of doing the job. In other words, their attitude was: "Yes, I am satisfied, but then how else could you do it?" Useful selection procedures or good selection tools do not seem to be topics of communication among science faculty members.

The above three groups were asked the following question: Do you consider your present selection procedures to be efficient? One hundred seventy-four faculty members were asked this question. One hundred and eighteen replied yes; 24 replied no; 33 replied they could not judge. Forty-five library staff members were queried. 38 replied yes; 5 no; and two said they could not judge. Of the 20 head librarians who were asked this question, 16 replied yes, and four replied no.

The head librarians and library staff members were also asked what suggestions they might have for improving the selection procedures in their library. Their replies can be grouped as follows:

| | Library Staff | Head Librarians |
|---|---|---|
| Acquire bibliographers (coordinators, collection developers) | 1 | 3 |
| Acquire science-reference specialists | 10 | 3 |
| Acquire more clerical help | 3 | 1 |
| Acquire and use better selection tools | 2 | 3 |
| Involve the faculty more in selection | 5 | 1 |
| Involve the library staff more in selection | 2 | 1 |
| Improve flow of information between faculty and library | 7 | 2 |
| Acquire more funds for selection activity | 5 | 1 |
| Institute more automatic ordering | 3 | 3 |
| Library should be better informed on plans of departments and institution | 3 | |
| Each department should have a liaison faculty member responsible for selection | 2 | |
| Develop and use more and better standard lists | | 3 |
| No suggestions | 10 | 7 |

The following additional comments were made by members of the various library staffs; the library should increase its pre-publication orders; there should be more involvement of graduate students in book selection; the library should compile a "selection thesaurus" from keywords abstracted from curriculum catalogs (i.e., course descriptions); it should scan convention or conference calendars of scientific organizations and write for any resulting publications; it should develop better methods for evaluating the usefulness of a book; it should be able to check "approval" books against available reviews; somehow, release time should be provided for faculty selectors; the library should use faculty selectors as an interim staff until library staff subject specialists can be acquired; and, the library profession should work towards the standardization of format and content in publishers' flyers.

The faculty members (175) were also asked what suggestions they might have for improving the library selection processes. Forty faculty members had no suggestions to offer. In the replies of the others, there were 26 suggestions that there should be more money and a clearer allocation of funds to the various departments; 20 that there should be a larger library staff with more specialists of one kind or another on it; 16 that a system was needed for better selection of the most worthwhile materials in a given area; 8 that there be better cooperative mechanisms between the faculty and the library; 8 that there be better cooperation within a given department; 5 that more standing orders and blanket orders be used; 3 that blanket orders be modified or eliminated; and, 3 that there be released time for faculty selection activities.

Nineteen head librarians were asked what kind of notices were returned to the selector after his suggestion for a new title was received by the library. The following notices were mentioned in their replies: a notice of arrival of the book in the library (mentioned 17 times); a notice indicating that the library already possessed the requested item (8 times); a notice of approval or disapproval of the request (twice); and, a notice of arrival only if specifically requested (once). Two head librarians indicated that the library provided no specific arrival notice, and that the only information returned to the selectors was an acquisitions list.

# Chapter IV. Collection Development and Library-Faculty Relationships

GUIDE IV

IT IS ADVANTAGEOUS TO DRAW UPON THE SUBJECT EXPERTISE OF FACULTY IN DEVELOPING THE COLLECTION.

*It may be desirable to do one or more of the following:*

- a. *Use the faculty to assess the collection.*
- b. *In universities, use graduate students in selection activities.*
- c. *Conduct instruction sessions on bibliographic tools for faculty library representatives.*
- d. *Establish a ~~separate~~* specific *area* in the library *as a bibliographic center.*
- e. *Explain selection-related routines, procedures, and problems to the faculty.*
- f. *When book fund allotments are made to departments, periodically inform them of the specific amount of the allotment and its current status.*

In most academic libraries it has proven advantageous in the development of the library's collections to draw upon the fund of subject knowledge and expertise available among members of the faculty. This does mean that the library should hand over collection building reponsibilities to the faculty, but simply that it is often beneficial that a working partnership between the two be established.

To elaborate somewhat, the library might consider implementing the following possible courses of action:

Chapter IV. Collection Development and Library-Faculty Relationships

1. The library could consider using the faculty to perform collection assessments by providing financial support for such work during non-teaching portions of the year.
2. In universities the use of graduate students in collection development and selection activities of a department might be formalized by creating a bibliographic assistant-ship within the department or within the library. The library would provide professional guidance on techniques, methods, and assignments.
3. The library could consider conducting a short course on professional collection tools and other bibliographic topics for the library representatives on the faculty.
4. The library could consider setting up a separate room or area as a bibliographic center for the representatives of the faculty which would contain those professional library tools deemed most useful to faculty selection efforts. This would be especially essential if the faculty, in fact, selects a large portion of the materials added to the collections.
5. The selection aids employed by the primary selection should go beyond the usual publishers' flyers and journal ads and embrace the broad range of bibliographic tools and aids.

6. The library should explain certain selection-related routines, procedures, and problems to the faculty, possibly by means of small "position" papers.
7. Where book fund allotments are made to the departments, they should be informed of the specific amount of the allotment and its status periodically during the course of the fiscal year.

## Chapter IV. Collection Development and Library-Faculty Relationships. 2b

The manner in which an academic library collection is selected seems to be, at least in part, a function of the size of the library and its parent institution. The present study, as well as the pertinent professional literature, would seem to indicate that, in general, and with certain exceptions, the smaller academic libraries tend to rely heavily upon the assistance of the faculty for aid in selecting titles and collection development, while the larger libraries tend to utilize their own staff more for these tasks. However, in both cases the faculty represent a source of great assistance to the library and should be utilized as fully as possible in the various tasks of collection building. Not only does this make sense in the actual building of the collections, but it is also one very good way to show to the faculty members that the library exists for their benefit as well as that of the students, and thereby involve them in its growth.

The faculty members interviewed at the 20 institutions studied in this project were in general agreement that they should have a say in the development of the library's collections. From information gathered during the study, it would seem that this sense of participation is satisfied if the faculty know it is free to make selection recommendations, whether they ever actually exercise this right or not. In many ways, it could be argued that the most efficient and sensible library would be one in which a specific book was already in the library and ready for use at the time a faculty member first becomes aware of it, and suggests it for purchase.

In order to advantageously involve the faculty in the library selection processes, several courses of action have been suggested above. It would be possible to "employ" a bibliographically interested faculty member for all or part of the summer, or any other free period, to study in depth that portion of the collection of which he has special knowledge. Such work might consist of the careful weeding of the collection, or an assessment of its gaps and weaknesses, or perhaps a series of detailed studied bibliographies. In any event, it might be possible to rotate such a "summer evaluators" position year by year through the various schools and departments of the university.

On a less expert level, sufficiently motivated graduate students might be similarly employed. Obviously such a student would not have the expertise of an experienced faculty member, but there would still be much he might do that would be above the level of clerical endeavor, for example, the compilation of lists and bibliographies, the checking for duplicates, the checking of holdings against standard lists in the fields, etc. All these would be worthwhile tasks.

Such a student could be either employed by the library directly, or by a teaching department; but if the latter, it should be under the direction of the professional library staff in order to ensure that the bibliographic tasks undertaken were properly structured and worth doing.

It goes without saying that such employement could be of considerable value to a student in exposing him to the full range of bibliographic resources in his chosen field.

One of the more interesting facts to come out of this study was the rather limited range of bibliographic tools known to and used by the faculty in selecting material for the library. It might be quite valuable to the faculty if a "short course" in bibliographic tools and methods were organized for the benefit of faculty selectors. Such a course or lecture, if properly presented, could introduce the faculty to the whole range of professional selection aids. The contacts with various faculty in the course of the present study tends to indicate that a substantial number might be interested in knowing more about such aids and utilizing them.

To follow this thought one step further, the library might well set up a special area or room in which the standard library bibliographic tools could be made available to faculty selectors. As it would be wasteful of money to duplicate these for all departments in the institution, and wasteful of time to circulate them among the various departments, the idea of a central research point would seem to be a useful one.

A further step that might be considered in improving rapport between the faculty and the library would be the issuance of position papers, or perhaps informative articles in the library bulletin, should one exist, concerning specific library routines and operations, including selection-related problems.

The study tended to show that, in general, faculty members have difficulty in understanding the problems faced by the library in acquiring materials and making them available for use. They tend to contrast the library's effort in this direction with the result they themselves could achieve by going directly to a good book store and purchasing a desired item. An example of the kind of thing which leads to misunderstanding is the fact that some states require their institutions of higher education to submit all purchases to a central purchasing agent in the state capitol. Such a procedure would obviously have severe effects on the time required to put a requested volume on the library shelves. It might prove politic for the library to acquaint the faculty with such requirements as it would seem that in many cases faculty dissatisfaction with certain aspects of its library service is really based on nothing more than the lack of information.

Another recommendation derived from the interviews of faculty members in the 20 institutions studied is concerned with the allotment of a portion of the book funds to the various academic schools and departments. When a library does make such allotments or allocations, it would seem best that the appropriate faculty be made aware of the amount allocated, and that periodic reports on the status of the fund be made during the course of the fiscal year. Though this procedure might seem self-evident to many, it was surprising to find a number of libraries where it was not practiced. The result at these libraries was the general feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of interested faculty members; the feeling that their help was required, but that their efforts were not considered important enough to keep them fully informed of financial decisions made by the library. It is rather obvious that such a situation does not tend to improve faculty-library relations.

As another step in improving these relations, certain faculty members interviewed would appreciate a year-end statement of the additions to the collection in their areas of interest. This statement could take the form of a classified acquisitions list or perhaps just a simple survey of the totals added to given areas within the library. Though perhaps some of the faculty would be completely disinterested in such information, it would seem that some (those who perhaps are potentially the library's best friends and heaviest users), would appreciate such listings and find them useful. Manually produced lists of this sort might prove prohibitively expensive, but, as automatic data handling devices (such as computers) become more common in academic libraries, the expense of producing such lists might prove to be well within reason.

Certain questions asked during the course of the interviews are pertinent to this chapter. These and their tabulated responses are summarized below.

"Does the library provide the faculty with book selection material?" A total of 66 head librarians and library staff members were asked this question. Twenty-eight of this group reported that they did not routinely provide selection information to the faculty; 38 said that they did provide this type of information. Typically the information provided took the form of publishers' flyers, advertisements, catalogs, and, in one case only, Library of Congress proof slips. The same question was also asked of the faculty. The response of the 174 faculty members to this was: no - 103; yes - 71. One might conclude that some discrepancy exists here, but since the selection information is generally transmitted to the departmental office rather than the individual faculty members, it is possible that some of the material stops at that point.

One of the questions which elicited the most interesting answers was, in effect, who should be responsible for selecting library materials in the science fields. Head librarians, library staff members, faculty members, administrators, and faculty library committee chairmen were all asked this question in one form or another.

| RESPONSES | Head Librarian (n=20) | Library Staff (n=45) | Faculty (n=178) | Adminis- tration (n=17) | F/L Committee (n=12) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Library Staff | 2 | 7 | 21 | 2 | 1 |
| Subject-specialist | 1 | — | 14 | — | 1 |
| Faculty | 6 | 11 | 33 | 5 | 4 |
| Joint responsibility<br>Both free to select | 11 | 29 | 32 | 10 | 6 |
| Library selects reference works; faculty all others | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Library does major selecting; faculty recommends | 3 | 5 | 14 |  | 3 |
| Faculty does major selecting; library recommends | 3 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 1 |
| Subject-specialist in consultation with faculty | 3 | 1 | 23 | 1 | — |
| Unspecified combination | — | 2 | 7 |  | — |
| Automatic Acquisition | 1 | — | 12 | 1 | 2 |

Table 1. Responses of various groups to the question:
"Who should be responsible for selecting science library materials?"

Some of these librarians stated the reasoning behind their answers. Four maintained that only the faculty has the necessary expertise for subject selection in the sciences, while three maintained that only the library staff has a full awareness of the need for continuity ~~is~~ and comprehensiveness in selection. Two stated that the library was, after all, charged with the responsibility of building collections and should do most of the selection, and one mentioned that as the faculty had assumed this responsibility for collection building it should continue with the job, and one that the faculty was much too busy to do a great deal of selecting.

The library staff members had some interesting reasons to give for their various responses. Nine of them stated that the faculty should do all or most of the selection because it has the greatest awareness of its own teaching needs and is moreover much more in touch with the literature of its field; 8 stated that the library should do all or most of the selection because its staff would have a greater awareness of the need for continuity and comprehensiveness in the book selections; 7 stated that only the faculty has the necessary expertise to do competent selection; 4 said that the faculty was much too busy to do a great deal of selecting; 2 said that the library is, after all, charged with the selection responsibility and should therefore carry it out; two that a library subject specialist with the necessary expertise should do the selecting; and 2 that only the library staff has knowledge of all available resources. One staff member said that he thought that the library would be much more in touch with literature of the field.

Among those faculty members who gave reasons for their answers, 42 said that only the faculty had the necessary expertise and should therefore make most or all of the selection; 27 said that since the faculty has the greatest awareness of its curriculum needs, and is much more in touch with the literature of its field, it should make most, or all of the selection decisions; 4 felt that only the library had sufficient knowledge of all available bibliographic sources and therefore should do most of the selecting; 2 said that since the library is charged with this responsibility it should do the selecting; 2 replied that only a library subject specialist has the necessary expertise; 2 that since the library has control over the budget it should also have the selection responsibility; and two that the library has a greater awareness of the needs for continuity and comprehensiveness in the collections.

Some of the reasons given by the academic administrators were: faculty has the greatest awareness of its need and is more in touch with the literature in its fields (given 3 times); the library has control over the budget and therefore should do the selecting (3 times); the library staff has greater awareness of the needs of continuity and comprehensiveness of the collections (twice); only the faculty has the necessary expertise (once); and, the library is charged with the responsibility and therefore should carry it out (once).

Perhaps the following quotations will help present the spirit of some of the individual comments:

"The faculty members are too specialized to do broad range selecting." "The sciences are too subdivided these days, it would require too many subject specialists to do the job." "The library can do a better job than the faculty in the interdisciplenary areas." "Selections made by the faculty lead to greater usage of materials by the students; the faculty should do the selecting because selection itself is an educative process." "If book funds are scarce, then the faculty should play a greater role in selection." "At the academic level, the librarian should select; at the research level, the faculty should select." "At all the good libraries I have ever been, the books were selected by non-librarians." "At a small school, the user should select; at a large university, the science subject specialist on the library staff should make the selections." One administrator would prefer to have the library do the selecting so as to "relieve the faculty of the tens of thousands of decisions involved each year."

An examination of the above replies shows that all four of the basic groups interviewed had a wide variety of opinions as to the best method of handling selection for their libraries, and that none of the major groups were unanimous in their convictions. However, each group can perhaps be categorized in terms of its general tendency to award the responsibility either to the librarians or to the faculty. The administrators generally answered in favor of the faculty. The faculty was predominantly in favor of having its own members do most of the selection. The librarians, for the most part, favored the joint responsibility with the faculty. While many different reasons were cited for the various positions taken by these groups, certain tendencies do tend to emerge. The reasons cited in favor of faculty dominance in the selection role center around the faculty members acknowledged expertise and their greater awareness of their own needs and those of the curriculum. Justification for a librarian dominance in selection was sought, first in the nature of the librarian's custodial role which provides them with a greater awareness of the need for continuity and comprehensiveness in the collection, and second, in the nature of library administration procedures and controls, and third, that librarians are charged with the final responsibility for the collections and do possess the budgetary control.

Another specific question asked the various groups during the interviews that has a bearing on the question of who is, or should be, responsible for the selection of titles and why, is the question: "What factors enter into the faculty's decision to select a specific title?" The following factors were cited in the answers of 175 faculty members: the relevance to the area of the member's own specific interest (cited 128 times); the author's reputation (94 times); the quality of the material (33 times); the publisher's reputation (30 times); the academic level of the material (28 times); the currentness of the material (19 times); the cost of the material

(19 times); the expected useful lifetime of the material (7 times); and the material's relation to curriculum interest (7 times).

In relation to the question of written selection or collection guidance policies, the science department faculty members interviwed (175) were asked: "Does your science department have a written selection policy?" One hundred and fifty-two replied no; two replied yes; two were not sure; 19 replied that there was nothing in writing, but that a policy of sorts existed nonetheless.

Questions as to the acceptability of the various microforms, e.g., microfilm, microfiche, microprint, were asked of both the faculty members and library staff members. One hundred seventy-three faculty members were queried, of whom 148 replied. Thirty-five replied that microforms are acceptable; 26 were neutral; 61 actively disliked microform; and 26 ordered microform only as a last resort. Of 31 librarians who replied to this question, 5 find microforms acceptable; 7 are neutral; 13 disliked microforms; and 6 order them only as a last resort.

In an attempt to discover if there was any significant interaction among the science department interviewed with regard to book selection procedures, 154 faculty members were asked if they were familiar with the selection procedures of the other science departments on their campus. Of these, 9 said that they knew what the other departments were doing; 37 said that they assumed the other departments were operating the same way; and 108 said that they didn't know how selection was handled in other departments.

The entire group of 175 faculty members were asked if they knew of colleagues in their department who were not involved in the selection of library materials. Of the 174 who replied, 75 said that everyone helps select titles; 84 said that there were those who didn't do any selecting; and 15 said that they didn't know. When the 84 faculty members who said that some of their colleagues did not do any of the selecting were asked why not, 31 replied that the non-selectors were satisfied that the job was being done by others; 17 that they were oldtimers who were less interested in new developments; 17 that they were simply apathetic or indifferent; 11 that they taught only elementary courses and therefore needed only textbooks; 11 that they were "not active in research"; and 3 that they were new members who had not yet learned the procedures.

At another point in the interviews the librarians were asked what they thought were the strong points of the selection procedures currently in use on their campus. The following features were cited as strong or beneficial by the 46 library staff members and 20 head librarians queried. Among the library staff members, 12 said that the present selection procedures encouraged the acquisition of relevant materials; 9 said that the present procedures ensured the comprehensiveness of the coverage; 7 stressed the speed of the present processes; 5 mentioned that the present procedures encouraged faculty involvement; 5 that the current selection coverage was truly selective and met the needs of the users; and 3 mentioned the economical use of available funds and manpower. Five staff members, however, said that the present selection

|  | Library Staff | Head Librarians |
|---|---|---|
| Not comprehensive enough; gaps and biases exist | 8 | 6 |
| Not selective enough | 3 | 3 |
| Slowness in acquisition | 1 | 2 |
| Uneconomical in use of funds and time | 1 | — |
| Not enough involvement of faculty | 3 | 2 |
| Responsibility is too diffuse, too scattered, not enough coordination | 2 | — |
| Consumes too much time of library staff in routine duties | 2 | 1 |
| No real check done on appropriateness of acquisitions | — | 1 |
| Inefficient procedures for retrospective acquisition | — | 1 |
| Disinterest or lack of time on faculty's part | 3 | 1 |
| Lack of science specialist | 3 | 2 |
| Aggressive faculty selectors may overbalance a collection | 2 | — |
| ~~See text~~ No weaknesses apparent | 7 | 4 |

procedures had no strong points worth mentioning. Of the 20 head librarians who were asked this question, 8 responded that present procedures encouraged faculty involvement; 7 mentioned the relevance of the materials acquired; 4 mentioned the speed of acquisition; 3 mentioned the comprehensiveness of coverage; and 3 the selectivity of the coverage; and one mentioned the economical use of available funds and manpower. One said that the present selection procedures had no strong points worth mentioning.

This same question was asked of 175 faculty members interviewed. Forty said that under the present system, the library was sensitive to the needs of the faculty; 30 said that the system is relevant to their needs; 19 stated that the system promotes good faculty-library interaction; 14 said that present procedures entail a minimum amount of faculty time; 19 cited the comprehensive coverage of their procedures; 9 the economy in the use of available funds; 9 the responsiveness and initiative of the library staff; 7 the speed of acquisition; 5 felt that their present procedures resulted in a continuing evaluation of the collections; and two mentioned the selectiveness of the coverage. Forty faculty members said that the present system had no strong points worth mentioning.

The question was then turned around, and the library staff members and head librarians were asked what the weaknesses of the present selection procedures were. Following is a tabulation of the responses.

The 175 faculty members were also asked to enumerate the weaknesses of the current selection procedures. Only 33 of the 175 replied that there were no weaknesses worth mentioning. The remaining 142 were dissatisfied in varying degrees in their current selection procedures, 71 of these mentioning specific points. Eighteen said that the current procedures did not result in a comprehensive coverage of the material available; six mentioned the poor selectivity of the current routine; four felt that the current methods resulted in inappropriate emphasis on certain sections of the subject; 17 said that the acquisition routines were too slow; one felt that they were wasteful of funds. Seven stated that, because of the lack of cooperation on the part of the library staff, there was too little faculty involvement in selection; two felt that their current procedures produced a lack of sensitivity to faculty needs; six that the routines required too much of their time; and nine mentioned that the procedures failed to provide a check on the adequacy of the collection. Additional scattered comments included the following: the system rests too much on one person; the system can result in over-representation in one field; the faculty-library representative has little free time to devote to the job and the result is a hasty performance on his part; there is a lack of feedback from the library, therefore we don't know if a book has been ordered until it is received; the collections often become slanted because too few of the faculty are involved; selection is too often done in a hurry and at the last minute.

A final query perhaps relevant to the question of faculty-library relationships was asked of the 17 faculty members who were chairmen of faculty library committees. They were asked what functions were performed by their committees. The following were mentioned in their replies: liaison between the library and the faculty members (10 times); liaison between the library and the academic administration (twice); the preparation of the book fund portion of the library budget (once); personnel decisions relating to new library positions (once); questions pertaining to staff salaries (4 times); the hiring of new staff (once); the development of book selection philosophy (once); and the planning of new library facilities (3 times). Only three of the chairmen reported that their committee was more than advisory in its relation to the library; that is, that it held decision-making powers.

## Chapter V. Automatic Approval and Acquisition Plans.

Guide V

THE USE OF ONE OR MORE AUTOMATIC ACQUISITION APPROVAL PLANS SHOULD BE SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED.

Academic libraries should at least consider the possibility of using one of the various automatic acquisition approval plans now available. Experience tends to show that such a system is often the most practical way for a library to obtain the majority of its current imprints.

Should such a plan be employed, the faculty should be fully informed as to its mechanisms and the extent of the plan.

One of the results of this study was the observation of the extent to which such acquisition plans are now in use, and the extent to which the reaction to such plans from both the library staff and the faculty has been favorable. One might say that these so-called automatic acquisition plans were the major innovation found by our investigation into selection procedures.

Certain objections still exist, however, to this kind of a plan. To some it would seem that it represents a default on the part of the library in its selection responsibility, or that it is simply a method of taking everything printed and thereby introducing inappropriate materials into a library's collections. In reality, both of these objections are based on misconceptions. In any good automatic approval acquisitions plan the library does not receive "everything", not even in specified subject areas. In order to begin such a plan the library is required to detail definite collecting specifications regarding areas and levels of interest; in effect it is a form of selection policy, albeit a rather broad one. The plan specifications are then used by the supplying agency as guides in directing the flow of materials to the library for its approval. Such plans therefore do not eliminate selection decisions on the part of the library and its selectors; rather the plans change the nature of the selecting process itself. Rather than basing the selection decision on secondary sources such as advertisements and reviews, the selector can now decide with the book in hand. Sufficient feedback can be built into such a system to ensure that omitted and rejected items can be used as checks on the adequacy of the guides and the degree to which they are being followed by the supplying agency.

Another criticism sometimes leveled at such a plan is that once a specific book is in the library it becomes the easier course of action to simply keep it. In reply to this, one could argue that if a selector cannot be trusted to make an appropriate decision with the book in hand, he could not really be expected to function well when working only with secondary sources of information.

On the other hand, there appear to be several decided advantages to this kind of a plan. Without a doubt they provide for a much more rapid addition of new imprints to the collection. If one takes a "active"ist view of the role of an academic library, viewing it as a service agency vitally involved in the teaching function of its parent institution (as opposed to a more passive "purchases required and hold on to the books" attitude), then it would seem obvious that it is preferable to have the appropriate new titles in the library as soon as, or preferably before, the need is expressed for them. This is possible under an automatic approval plan.

Additionally, so-called automatic approval acquisition plans can quite often provide more comprehensive coverage of the world's production of scholarly English language publications and is possible on the basis of piecemeal selection, in which each title must be expressly requested.

Though no complete financial appraisal of such plans in action was developed in this investigation, it would appear that certain financial benefits might accrue to the subscribing library. Among the services offered by at least one of the firms providing such a plan, is the inclusion of completed order department "multiple slips," with each volume submitted on approval. The multiple form is imprinted with the name of the library being supplied and is of whatever design is required by the individual library. It would seem that the clerical services saved by having these forms typed out by the jobber would be considerable.

In any case, these services do represent an attempt at a new and superior service for libraries, and as stated before, should at least be considered to see if they might prove advantageous to a given academic library.

Should such a service be inaugurated by a library, it would seem prudent that all the current selectors and interested faculty be made fully aware of the scope and details of the plan. If interested parties are shown the workings of such a plan, and possibly involved in the initial detailing of the collection specifications, it seems quite likely that, not only are more accurate guides likely to be drawn up, but that the objections of those interested (usually based on incomplete knowledge of the service), will be forestalled to the benefit of all concerned.

As comprehensive approval plans are still quite new, comparatively little data concerning them was developed during the course of this study. However, it was noted in Chapter III that five of the larger institutions studied utilized a type of approval acquisitions plan to obtain most of their current English language imprints.

It is the impression of the author and the interviewers who studied these libraries, that all concerned were quite satisfied with their approval plans; in fact, considerable enthusiasm was apparent on the part of many involved with this system.

As the approval plan* employed by the greater part of the five involved libraries now works, selection guides based upon the collecting interests of the individual libraries are first worked out. Then, commencing at a specified time, the firm begins to supply the library with those volumes that, in its opinion, meet these guides. As the firm is attempting to obtain copies of all scholarly material published in English in most parts of the world, it completes book order multiple forms for all these, not just those actually being sent to the library. Those multiples sent a library without the corresponding volume show the library staff what titles it has not received as a result of the supplier's interpretation of the collection guides.

---

* Offered by a firm based in Oregon.

Any book wanted but not sent may then be ordered from the supplier by simply returning one copy of the completed multiple, already in the possession of the library.

On the other hand, as all the items are sent on approval, anything that the recipient library receives but considers inappropriate may be returned.

The interaction of books not sent, but wanted, and books returned, serve as checks upon the adequacy and interpretation of the library's collection guides. It has been stated by an official of the company under discussion that during the course of the first year or so that a library utilizes such a plan, this interplay of rejects and additional requests usually serves to considerably refine the initial selection guides.

The success of such a service is in large part a function of the success of the supplier in actually obtaining copies of all significant English language volumes in the geographical areas concerned. Additional complicating factors are reprints, new editions, books in series, etc. It is the impression of the author that most of those contracting for such a service are, in general, satisfied that the Oregon-based firm succeeds quite well in overcoming such problems.

It is the result of the generally favorable reaction to such automatic acquisition approval plans that the recommendation is made that academic libraries, especially those above a certain medium size, should consider the feasibility of utilizing such a system.

## Chapter VI. Conclusions.

~~Chapter VI. Conclusions.~~

Certain conclusions based upon data collected at the 20 institutions visited during the course of this study may be summarized in a rather concise form. These have been, in general, touched upon in the preceding chapters, but in some cases have been placed in subordinate positions in order to better highlight the acquisition guides. Therefore it might be of interest to present these now in a more straightforward manner:

1. There was a relatively limited number of basic types the selection procedures found across the sample of institutions studied.
2. Selection policy statements generally do NOT exist. Where present, they on occasion provide guidance on necessary selection decisions.
3. Automatic acquisition approval plans are becoming more common. These do not eliminate decision-making; rather they serve to change the nature of the selection tools from related information, book reviews, etc., to the material itself.
4. Most respondents feel that their institutions attempt to adequately support their libraries, but nevertheless they complain of lack of library funds.
5. Some of the head librarians feel that the sciences do present the library with unique budgeting problems.

6. With respect to the manner and results of the selection procedures utilized, no important differences were found among the three sciences studied (chemistry, physics and biology), even though little communication regarding selection procedures exists among the three science departments on a given campus.
7. A lack of comprehensiveness or unevenness is a major complaint lodged against the average library collection. More money and staff are the usual suggested remedies.
8. A part of the library's acquisition funds is usually subdivided into departmental allotments, with the departments usually granted a considerable control over its usage.
9. While the head librarians normally have more control than anyone else over questions of acquisition and departmental allotments, the faculty have major influence over the library budget through their contacts with the administration. Even though the libraries prepare the draft budget, the administration is sometimes more influenced by the faculty on questions of "collection adequacy" as it influences the budget.
10. Most administrative personnel and faculty believe that the faculty should do the majority of the book selecting. On the other hand, the librarians often seek a joint responsibility with the faculty.

11. The faculty members were the predominant book selectors with allocated funds in a majority of the institutions sampled.
12. Even though the faculty in general is heavily involved in book selection on many campuses, not all of the faculty are involved in this process.
13. The complaints of interested faculty members appear to be the main continuing evaluative mechanism with regard to the library's operations as considered in this report.
14. Most of the librarians ~~in~~ AS WELL AS MOST OF the faculty are satisfied with their present selection procedures. Most faculty are unfamiliar with alternative procedures.
15. The administrators and the faculty library committee chairment at developing institutions were in general more dissatisfied with the support and attention given their library than were their counterparts at more stable institutions. Their complaints centered on the size of the book collections and the inadequacy of the library staffing.
16. Satisfaction with present science library selection procedures was higher among the head librarians and faculty at stable institutions as compared with the developing institutions studied.

17. The lack of a clear selection policy was a major problem noted by head librarians at developing institutions. At the majority of those institutions in which the library staff tends to dominate the selection procedures the library administration does not create separate book budgets for the various departments. At those institutions in which the faculty does a preponderance of the selection such separate budgets are usually created.
18. Head librarians are usually more satisfied with their selection procedures at those schools in which the library staff does a preponderance of the selection as opposed to the faculty. The faculty would seem to be equally satisfied at both types of institutions.

Some of the above points are obvious, some perhaps truisms, while many have been instinctively felt to be true. Hopefully it has been worth stating them in the context of this report as there is now a body of statistical data upon which they can be definitely based. Regardless of how many may "know" that a certain statement is true, it is, in most cases, preferable to be able to offer proof in support of its correctness.

# APPENDICES

Appendix A: Selection Policy and Objectives

Appendix B: Technical Data

# APPENDIX A

Included here are means of implementing some of the guides cited earlier. Primary attention is given to the selection policy guide; certain forms useful to data collection efforts in this regard are presented.

## SELECTION POLICY AND OBJECTIVES

It was stated that information exists within an institution which can serve as a basis for indicating the particular set of selection procedures, principles, and decisions appropriate to a particular library. This information was categorized as: (a) the service objectives of the institution and library, (b) environmental factors that can influence the nature of the collection or selection action, (c) collection specifications, and (d) current selection needs.

The following sections attempt to be more specific about the sources of such information.

### Service Policy

Information on this topic is desired so that a clear picture can be obtained as to what the institution is seeking to achieve and what groups are most intimately involved in these endeavors. As with all of the information discussed in these sections, the library should acquire it in order to deduce meaningful operational statements relating to the collections.

#### Institutional Objectives

Three sources of information are suggested for the librarian to investigate in determining what the institution seeks to accomplish. The sources differ among themselves in terms of direct relevance to objectives; some address themselves to the question directly, others contribute indirectly by providing information on smaller aspects of the issue. Taken together, information from these sources can provide an over-view of institutional objectives useful to the library in assessing its own contribution to the institution.

### Statements Regarding Major Objectives

Ideally, the major objectives of the institution would be available in some public document designed to inform all concerned. If such a statement exists, it should answer such questions as:

What is the nature of its productive goals?

What activities or standards are most valued by the institution?

What areas of endeavor or what portions of society does it claim responsibility toward?

Does it seek eminence in some field of endeavor?

Answers to these broad questions would clarify the objectives of the institution to the extent that the librarian could perceive certain foci of interest common to all elements of the institution. If they are not available, then the following items are suggested as possible sources of statements of major objectives:

- President's or Chancellor's Annual Reports
- Board of Trustee's Reports
- Charter of the Institution
- Published History of the Institution

96

- Reports prepared for accreditation purposes
- Various catalogs of the institution
- Faculty Senate documents.

Supplemental information bearing on major institutional objectives may be found in documents which address themselves to more specific topics. These include:

- Admission policy
- Faculty employment standards
- Statement of faculty duties and responsibilities
- Policies regarding contractual research
- Policies regarding institutes within the total institution

Attention may also be profitable directed toward actions taken by the institution; the rationale being that even in the absence of written objectives, the institution has acted in accordance with some principle or toward some goal. Potentially relevant institutional actions or their results may be indicated by:

- Budgetary documents indicating what activities received financial support and with what relative emphasis
- Advanced degrees held by the faculty
- Occupational data on alumni

97

- Registrar's data on present students:
  - Average family income
  - Distribution on standard placement tests
  - Degrees pursued
  - Career objectives
  - Part-time versus full-time student ratio

User Groups

The second part of a service policy statement should identify those groups of people with whom the library will interact in accomplishing the objectives of the institution. More specifically, the nature of the demands such groups make upon the library should be detailed and implications drawn for collection development and for related library activities.

A suggested data collection form for acquiring such information is presented herein. It provides for: (a) identification of the various groups, (b) an indication of each group's relative size, (c) the intended purpose such groups have in using the library, (d) the type of materials used in accomplishing these purposes, and (e) the physical activities engaged in during accomplishment of these purposes.

The form is merely suggestive; certain items may be changed to fit a particular library's needs. Completion of the form is accomplished by rating each group on each item in terms of the four-point scale shown at the bottom of the form. This scale reflects the general frequency of contact or interaction of a group with a purpose, type material, or activity.

As a first approach, the information needed to complete this form could be acquired from the library staff. One method would be to have those staff members whom you believe to possess this information rate the total form independently. Comparison of their ratings may show areas of high and low agreement; where disagreement exists, use the ratings of the person most knowledgeable in that area. It is quite likely that no one person is fully informed in all areas and all groups. This in itself is one benefit of the form - it brings together in one place important pieces of information that were formerly spread among many staff members and, as such, were not available for use in a unified fashion.

USER GROU.

|  | Lower Division | Upper Division | Graduate, M.A. | Graduate, Ph.D. | Postgraduate | Teaching Staff | Research Staff | Administration | General Public | External Professional | Library Staff | Neighboring Institutions | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| elative size (% of total users) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| requency of visits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| uration of visits* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ses materials to accomplish: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recreational reading |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required course reading |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extra-course reading |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course research projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Original research project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching purposes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintaining proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ype material used: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Books |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Periodicals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newspapers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manuscripts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government publications |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Audio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Films |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Microform |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Foreign language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rare |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ctivities: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Borrows material |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interacts with library staff, e.g. reference functions, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uses library as a work center |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Makes selection recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uses inter-library loan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uses reproduction facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTE: Each relevant group should be rated on the following scale for each item:

0 -- Never
1 -- Seldom
2 -- Occasionally
3 -- Frequently

* A. Less than 1 hour
B. 1 - 2 hours
C. 2 - 4 hours
D. More than 4 hours

A second approach which can be used at a later stage is to acquire more objective information upon which to base the ratings. For example, the users can be surveyed as to their purposes in using the library.

It should be noted that certain sections of this form can also be used to indicate the desired state of affairs as well as the present user situation. That is, the statements of objectives mentioned earlier could be translated into desired ratings for various items and groups. For example, assume that service to the local community is a desired objective; it would receive high ratings for recreational reading (purposes section), books (type material), and borrowing material (activities). By having the forms completed, for both the actual and the desired situation, discrepancies can be perceived and appropriate remedial actions taken.

## Environmental Characteristics

The librarian should determine and be aware of all aspects of the user groups, the university, or external environment, which could or should have implications for collection development activities. A partial checklist of such environmental factors, along with an indication of their potential impact is presented below.

## Environmental Characteristics

| Factor | Potential Implications For: |
|---|---|
| Relative geographical isolation of the institution | Provision of materials relating to the cultural/recreational needs of users |
| Financial characteristics of the students | Provision of texts related to course work |
| Degree standards for faculty employment | Provision of materials related to self-educational efforts on faculty's part |
| Presence/absence of library resources external to the institution | The degree of self-sufficiency or completeness of coverage sought for the collection areas |
| Relationship to neighboring educational units | The type of areas in which collection duplication will and should occur and the level of the material acquired in these areas |
| Relationship to local industries | Provision of technical reports and bibliographic services |

| Factor | Potential Implications For: |
|---|---|
| Relationship to local professional groups | Provision of specialized subcollections |
| Contractual research performed by the institution | Provision of bibliographic services and acquisition of specialized materials |

As indicated, this listing is a partial one; its main purpose lies in broadening the librarian's awareness of those aspects of the general environment which have a conceivable impact upon collection planning.

## Collection Specifications

The major portions of the total library collections result from the needs of the academic subjects or fields which comprise the teaching and research areas of the institution; smaller portions arise as a result of special collections and interests not directly related to academic areas.

This section presents a method for acquiring the information needed to define these specific areas of academic concern and to determine what actions are needed to achieve adequate collections within these areas. The basic approach is that of a "collection census" and is embodied in Form 2.*

This information is of an "apolitical" nature in that it is needed to guide selection decisions regardless of who is actually responsible for making selection decisions. Much of it has the department as its source; portions of it may be generated by the library staff. If desired, additional information could be sought from the department at this time. Questions, for example, on the relative amount of retrospective collecting to be engaged in; preferences regarding the language of acquired materials; whether the department has need of special materials or facilities, and other selection-related matters could be included along with Form 2.

---

*The "desired acquisition levels" portion of this form was obtained from a similar assessment aid devised by San Francisco State College.

The library could also question the departments as to the manner and extent to which the library is expected to aid the instructional program and research activities of the department.

Form 2

| | | AREAS | |
|---|---|---|---|
| lication Date: | | | |
| Specific Purposes* | | | |
| Needed (already published) | | | |

red Acquisition Levels

Books and other materials in numbers and variety sufficient to meet the needs of all students in their course work and advanced study and to enable instructors to prepare for their classroom work and research.

Books and other materials in numbers and variety sufficient to meet the needs of undergraduate students in their course work and to enable instructors to prepare for their classroom work.

Materials for general reading; basic works in field.

Limited holdings of key materials needed in answering most common reference questions.

Prepared by________________________

Date ____________________________

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of Books Currently Held | | |
| Distribution of Current Holdings by Publication Date: | | |
| | Pre 1920 | |
| | 1921-1930 | |
| | 1931 - 1940 | |
| | 1941 - 1950 | |
| | 1951 - 1960 | |
| | 1961 - present | |
| Evaluation of Adequacy of Holdings for Specific Purposes* | | |
| Teaching: | Lower Division | |
| | Upper Division | |
| | Graduate | |
| Research | | |
| Other (specify) | | |
| Estimated Number of Additional Books Needed (already published) | | |
| Desired Acquisition Level** | | |
| Foreign Languages: | | |
| | (a) Include | |
| | (b) Exclude | |

* Evaluation Levels

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Adequate
4. Poor
5. Non-existent

** Desired Acquisition Levels

A. Books and other materials in numbers and vari course work and advanced study and to enable

B. Books and other materials in numbers and vari in their course work and to enable instructor

C. Materials for general reading; basic works in

D. Limited holdings of key materials needed in a

It should be recognized that information of this nature has a limited lifetime of usefulness and should be periodically updated. The frequency of such updating efforts is dependent upon the rapidity of change experienced at each institution.

## Current Selection Needs

Current selection needs are provided to a major extent by the information in Form 2 which indicates the number of books desired from retrospective and current sources in specific collection areas. These key areas, as cited by the departments, represent the major subjects of concern but possibly are not the only areas of interest. For example, some survey of a subject area's present contents is needed to inform the department of the extent of existing materials in the areas cited. If this survey goes further and encompasses the totality of holdings in a given subject, then areas may be seen to exist which were not cited (e.g., past areas of emphasis, gift collections, etc.). The department should be informed of their existence and a decision should be made as to any further support to be given them. These lesser areas may then contribute--most likely on a lesser basis--to current selection needs.

# APPENDIX B

This appendix contains forms used in the data collection portion of the study and the lists of basic books, journals, and topics employed. In addition to these, lists of specific selection tools cited by the respondents are included.

~~B-1~~

# LIST OF SELECTION TOOLS SPECIFICALLY CITED BY FACULTY AND LIBRARY STAFF MEMBERS

~~8-2~~

102

## LIST 1:

## SELECTION TOOLS CITED IN INTERVIEWS

## WITH SCIENCE FACULTY

### Chemistry

Serials (As a source of reviews, abstracts, bibliographies and publisher's notices)

| Frequency | Title |
|---|---|
| (3) | American Chemical Society. Journal |
| (1) | American Scientist |
| (1) | Analytical Chemistry |
| (1) | Chemical Abstracts |
| (6) | Chemical & Engineering News |
| (1) | Faraday Society. Transactions |
| (15) | Journal of Chemical Education |
| (1) | Nature |
| (2) | Physics Today |
| (11) | Science |

~~B-3~~

# Physics

**Serials** (As a source of reviews, abstracts, bibliographies and publisher's notices)

| Frequency | Title |
|---|---|
| (8) | American Journal of Physics |
| (3) | American Scientist |
| (1) | Journal of Research. Section A: Physics and Chemistry |
| (1) | Mathematical Reviews |
| (1) | The Physics Teacher |
| (22) | Physics Today |
| (1) | Publisher's Weekly |
| (1) | Review of Modern Physics |
| (11) | Science |
| (2) | Scientific American |

**Monographs**

| | |
|---|---|
| (10) | American Institute of Physics. Check List of Books and Periodicals for an Undergraduate Physics Library. Lancaster, Pa., The Institute, 1962 |

## Biology

Serials (As a source of reviews, abstracts, bibliographies and publisher's notices)

| Frequency | Title |
|---|---|
| (2) | American Journal of Botany |
| (1) | American Medical Association. Journal |
| (6) | American Scientist |
| (1) | Bacteriological Reviews |
| (3) | Biological Abstracts |
| (7) | Bioscience |
| (2) | Current Contents, Chemical, Pharmaco-Medical & Life Sciences Edition |
| (1) | Developmental Biology |
| (1) | Ecology |
| (1) | Entomological Society of America. Annals |
| (1) | Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology. Federation Proceedings |
| (1) | Journal of Animal Ecology |
| (1) | Journal of Biological Chemistry |
| (1) | Nature |
| (1) | Plant Physiology |
| (2) | Publisher's Weekly |
| (11) | Quarterly Review of Biology |

(Biology Serials, cont'd)

| | |
|---|---|
| (1) | Royal Entomological Society of London. Proceedings. Series A: General Entomology |
| (1) | Royal Society. Proceedings. Series B: Biological Sciences |
| (1) | Saturday Review |
| (27) | Science |
| (2) | Scientific American |
| (2) | Turtox News (General Biological Supply House, Inc.) |
| (1) | Wildlife Review |

Other

| | |
|---|---|
| (6) | American Institute of Biological Sciences: various lists of recommended books |
| (3) | Society of Systematic Zoology: various lists of recommended books |

## LIST II:

## SELECTION TOOLS CITED IN INTERVIEWS WITH LIBRARY STAFF MEMBERS

### Chemistry

Serials

| Frequency | Title |
|---|---|
| (1) | American Book Publishing Record |
| (1) | Analytical Chemistry |
| (1) | Aslib Book-List |
| (2) | Chemical & Engineering News |
| (1) | Chemistry and Industry |
| (4) | Journal of Chemical Education |
| (2) | Nature |
| (1) | New Technical Books |
| (2) | Science |

Monographs

| | |
|---|---|
| (1) | Crane, E. J. and others. A Guide to the Literature of Chemistry. New York, Wiley, 1957 |
| (1) | Mellon, M. G. Chemical Publications, Their Nature and Use. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1958 |

~~B-7~~

## Physics

### Serials

| Frequency | Title |
|---|---|
| (1) | American Journal of Physics |
| (1) | American Scientific Books |
| (1) | Electronics |
| (2) | Nature |
| (1) | New Technical Books |
| (1) | Nuclear Engineering |
| (1) | Nucleonics |
| (5) | Physics Today |
| (1) | Publisher's Weekly |
| (1) | Technical Book Review Index |

### Other

| | |
|---|---|
| (1) | Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux: various publications |

~~B-8~~

## Biology

### Serials

| Frequency | Title |
|---|---|
| (1) | American Biology Teacher |
| (1) | American Book Publishing Record |
| (1) | American Midland Naturalist |
| (1) | Biological Abstracts |
| (3) | Bioscience |
| (2) | Books in Print |
| (1) | Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists |
| (1) | Cumulative Book Index |
| (1) | Daedalus |
| (1) | Ecology |
| (1) | Eugenics Quarterly |
| (1) | Mankind Quarterly |
| (1) | National Library of Medicine Current Catalog |
| (1) | Natural History |
| (3) | Nature |
| (1) | New Technical Books |
| (1) | Publisher's Weekly |
| (1) | Quarterly Review of Biology |
| (1) | Research Grants Index (USPHS) |
| (4) | Science |

(Biology Serials, cont'd)

(1) Science and Children

(1) Science Education

(1) Stechert-Hafner Book News

Other

(1) Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux: various publications

## Science -- Unspecified

### Serials

| Frequency | Title |
|---|---|
| (1) | AIAA Bulletin |
| (1) | ALA Bulletin |
| (3) | American Book Publishing Record |
| (1) | Aslib Book-List |
| (1) | Bibliographische Berichte/Bibliographical Bulletin |
| (1) | Bioscience |
| (1) | British Book News |
| (1) | Bulletin of Bibliography and Magazine Notes |
| (9) | Choice |
| (3) | College and Research Libraries |
| (1) | Franklin Institute Journal |
| (1) | Interdoc |
| (12) | Library Journal |
| (1) | Les Livre du Mois |
| (4) | Nature |
| (5) | New Technical Books |
| (2) | New York Times Book Review |
| (4) | Publisher's Weekly |
| (1) | Recorder (Columbia University Engineering Library) |

~~B-11~~

## Science - Unspecified (Serials cont'd)

| | |
|---|---|
| (5) | Science |
| (1) | Science News |
| (1) | Scientific American |
| (1) | Scientific Information Notes |
| (2) | Special Libraries |
| (1) | Stechert-Hafner Book News |
| (1) | Subject Guide to Books in Print |
| (1) | Sunday Times (London) Literary Supplement |
| (2) | Technical Book Review Index |
| (1) | UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries |
| (2) | Wilson Library Bulletin |

## Monographs

| | |
|---|---|
| (1) | Brown, Charles H. Scientific Serials. Chicago, Association of College and Research Libraries, 1956 |
| (3) | Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory. Vol. 1, Scientific, Technical & Medical... 12th ed., edited by Marietta Chicorel. New York, Bowker, 1967 |
| (1) | Union List of Serials. 3rd ed., New York, H. W. Wilson, 1965 |
| (3) | Walford, A. J. Guide to Reference Material. 2nd ed., Vol. 1, Science & Technology. London, The Library Association, 1966 |

## Other

| | |
|---|---|
| (2) | Library of Congress Proof Sheets |

# QUESTIONNAIRE AND DATA FORMS
# COMPLETED BY THE LIBRARY AND FACULTY

## QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What was the total number of volumes in your library at the end of 1966? ______________________________

2. What is the size of your library staff (professional and non-professional)? ______________________________

3. What is your total college or university enrollment?

______________________________________________

# DEPARTMENTAL INFORMATION

College/University________________________ Person Providing Data________________

Department______________________________ Date____________________________

---

## FACULTY/STAFF

Total Number________________________

Professors ________________________

Associate Professors ________________ Assistant Professors________________

Instructors ________________________

Teaching Assistants ________________

Lecturers __________________________

---

## DEGREES HELD (Faculty Only)

Ph.D.____________ M.A., M.S. ____________ B.A. ____________

Prescribed College/University Teaching Load ________________________________

Modal or Average (which) Teaching Load ____________________________________

## CURRICULUM

Total Number of Courses ________________________

Lower Division (Freshman/Sophomore) ________________

Upper Division (Junior/Senior) ____________________

Graduate ________________________________________

Number of Introductory Lecture Sections (per semester)________________________

Number of Laboratory Courses (per semester) ________________________________

---

## DEPARTMENTAL ENROLLMENT*

Total Enrollment__________________ Fulltime____________ Parttime____________

Number of Undergraduate Majors______________ Graduate Majors________________

Lower Division (F/S) Enrollment______________ M.A.__________ Ph.D.__________

Upper Division (Jr./Sr.) Enrollment________________________

---

* Base enrollment figures on previous registration period - Fall, 1966

## Budgeted Amount and/or Expenditures of Your Institution

## For Education and General Purposes

## For Past Five Fiscal Years *

| Fiscal Year | Budgeted Amount | Expenditures |
|---|---|---|
| 1961-62 | | |
| 1962-63 | | |
| 1963-64 | | |
| 1964-65 | | |
| 1965-66 | | |

* This figure should include budgeted amounts or expenditures for general administration and general expense, instruction and departmental research, extension and public services, libraries, operations and maintenance of physical plant, organized research, and organized activities relating to educational departments.

## Total Budgeted Amount and/or Expenditures of Your Library

## For Past Five Fiscal Years

| Fiscal Year | Budgeted Amount | Expenditures |
|---|---|---|
| 1961-62 | | |
| 1962-63 | | |
| 1963-64 | | |
| 1964-65 | | |
| 1965-66 | | |

## Bookfund Expenditures for Periodicals[1] and Books[2]

## For Past Five Fiscal Years

| Fiscal Year | Periodical Expenditures | Book Expenditures |
|---|---|---|
| 1961-62 | | |
| 1962-63 | | |
| 1963-64 | | |
| 1964-65 | | |
| 1965-66 | | |

[1] A periodical is defined as a serial publication which constitutes one issue in a continuous series under the same title, usually published at regular intervals over an indefinite period, individual issues in the same series being numbered consecutively.

[2] A book is defined as a unit of publication, either bibliographically independent or a volume in a series published under the same title, consisting of leaves, sheets, or signatures sewn or otherwise bound together, covered or uncovered. Bound volumes of periodicals and newspapers are not considered books.

## Total Amount Allocated to Science Areas[3]

## For Books and Periodicals for Past Five Fiscal Years

| Fiscal Year | Biology | Botany | Zoology | Chemistry | Physics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1961-62 | | | | | |
| 1962-63 | | | | | |
| 1963-64 | | | | | |
| 1964-65 | | | | | |
| 1965-66 | | | | | |

[3] Fill in amounts for Biology Department only if there are not separate Botany and Zoology Departments.